arXiv:1405.0866v2 [math.DS] 4 Dec 2014

A GENERAL MECHANISM OF DIFFUSION IN HAMILTONIAN SYSTEMS: QUALITATIVE RESULTS

MARIAN GIDEA[†], RAFAEL DE LA LLAVE[‡], AND TERE SEARA[♭]

Abstract. We present a general mechanism to establish the existence of diffusing orbits in a large class of nearly integrable Hamiltonian systems. Our approach relies on the scattering map (outer) dynamics and on the recurrence property of the (inner) dynamics restricted to a normally hyperbolic invariant manifold. We apply topological methods to find trajectories that follow these two dynamics. This method differs, in several crucial aspects, from earlier works. There are virtually no assumptions on the inner dynamics, as the method does not use at all the invariant objects for the inner dynamics (e.g., primary and secondary tori, lower dimensional hyperbolic tori and their stable/unstable manifolds, Aubry-Mather sets). The method applies when the unperturbed Hamiltonian is not necessarily convex, and of arbitrary degrees of freedom. In addition, this mechanism is easy to verify (analytically or numerically) in concrete examples, as well as to establish diffusion in generic systems. We include several applications, such as bridging large gaps in a priori unstable models in any dimension, and establishing diffusion in cases when the inner dynamics in a non-twist map.

1. Introduction

In this paper we develop a general and simple mechanism to show the existence of diffusing orbits in nearly integrable Hamiltonian systems in any dimension. The main requirement for the system is to have a normally hyperbolic invariant manifold whose stable and unstable manifolds intersect transversally along a transverse homoclinic manifold. In this setting, one can geometrically define a map on the normally hyperbolic invariant manifold, referred to as the scattering map [23], which accounts for the 'outer' dynamics along homoclinic orbits. This map is defined by assigning to the foot-point of an unstable fiber the foot-point of a stable fiber, provided the two fibers meet at a unique point in the homoclinic manifold. There is also an 'inner dynamics', defined by restricting the dynamics to the normally hyperbolic invariant manifold. The main results of this paper can be summarized as follows:

(i) For every pseudo-orbit generated by alternatively applying the scattering map and the inner dynamics for sufficiently long time, there exists a true orbit of the system near that pseudo-orbit;

Key words and phrases. Arnold diffusion; normally hyperbolic invariant manifolds; shadowing.

[†] Research of M.G. was partially supported by NSF grant DMS-0635607.

[‡] Research of R.L. was partially supported by NSF grant DMS-1162544.

[♭] Research of T.S. was partially supported by Russian Scientific Foundation grant 14-41-00044.

(ii) Assuming that almost every point in the normally hyperbolic invariant manifold is recurrent relative to the inner dynamics, for every pseudo-orbit obtained by successively applying the scattering map alone, there exists a true orbit of the system near that pseudo-orbit;

(iii) In the case of a nearly integrable Hamiltonian system, under some generic conditions that are verifiable, the above results imply the existence of diffusing orbits that travel a distance that is independent of the size of the perturbation; more precisely, if the inner dynamics has a domain on which the Poincaré recurrence theorem applies, and the scattering map goes along some curve contained in that domain, then there exist diffusing orbits that, following the scattering map and the inner dynamics, go along that curve; if the inner dynamics has a domain on which the Poincaré recurrence theorem does not apply, then there exist diffusing orbits determined by the inner dynamics alone.

The above results remain valid if one considers several transverse homoclinic manifolds rather than a single one, and the appropriate scattering maps. They also remain valid if one considers a sequence of manifolds (which may be of different topologies) chained by different scattering maps.

As a concrete application of this method we obtain a qualitative result on the existence of diffusing orbits in a priori unstable Hamiltonian systems of any dimension, under generic conditions on the perturbation that are verifiable in concrete systems, and under some mild conditions on the unperturbed system. In particular, the unperturbed Hamiltonian does not need to be convex.

All the results of the paper rely on the main shadowing lemma type result (i). To prove (ii) and (iii) we use the recurrence property of the inner dynamics to construct a pseudo-orbit combining the inner and the outer dynamics and then we only need to apply (i) to obtain a true orbit which closely follows the constructed pseudo-orbit. The proof of (i) uses the method of correctly aligned windows. The novelty here consists in the construction of sequences of windows: each window has one component that expands along the unstable manifold, a second component that contracts along the stable manifold, and a third component that is chosen recursively to be inside the corresponding component of the previous window in the sequence. The correctly alignment of the windows is ensured by the hyperbolicity of the normally hyperbolic invariant manifold and by the transversality of the intersection between its stable and unstable manifolds. These correctly aligned windows yield true orbits of the system.

The salient features of the mechanism outlined above can be encapsulated as follows:

(1) We do not require any information on the inner dynamics. In particular, we can obtain diffusing orbits whose action variable crosses resonant surfaces of any multiplicity. This is a significant departure from previous approaches which rely on a detailed analysis of the invariant objects for the inner dynamics: primary KAM tori, secondary tori, lower dimensional hyperbolic tori and their stable and unstable manifolds, Aubry-Mather sets, etc. In fact, we do not need the inner dynamics to satisfy a twist condition, which is a key assumption both in geometric or variational methods.

(2) The normally hyperbolic invariant manifold as well as its stable and unstable manifolds can be of arbitrary dimensions.
(3) While the focus of this paper is on qualitative results, we can combine this method with averaging theory to obtain quantitative information on the diffusing orbits, e.g., to estimate the speed of diffusion (see Remark 4.3).
(4) Although the main application in this paper is on diffusion in a priori unstable systems, we expect that this method can be useful when applied to a priori stable systems, as well as to infinite dimensional systems, once the existence of suitable normally hyperbolic manifolds (called normally hyperbolic cylinders in [41, 42, 2, 47]) is established.
(5) Our approach can be applied to concrete systems, and, further, it can be implemented in computer assisted proofs for the existence of diffusing orbits in concrete examples, e.g, in the planar elliptic restricted three-body problem. See the closely related paper [7].

The existence of diffusing orbits has been proved for different types of Hamiltonian systems. It is customary to distinguish between the so-called geometric methods and the variational methods.

The method in this paper is geometric. We first compare it with some related papers that share similar geometric ideas. Then we compare it with some other approaches.

The existence of diffusion for nearly integrable Hamiltonian systems of two and a half degrees of freedom has been established via geometric methods in [20, 14], by using the existence of KAM tori, primary and secondary, along the normally hyperbolic invariant manifold. The perturbation in [14] is assumed to be a trigonometric polynomial in the angle variable, but [26] eliminates this assumption. The integrable Hamiltonian is not assumed to be convex, which seems to be the standard assumption in many variational approaches. Similar type of results have been obtained in [32, 30] with the use of the method of correctly-aligned windows. This allows to simplify the proofs and to obtain explicit estimates on the diffusion speed.

The case of higher dimensional Hamiltonian systems poses a difficulty that is not present in the case of two and a half degrees of freedom: there are points where the resonances have higher multiplicity. The technique involved in [20, 14] uses heavily that in the neighborhood of resonances of multiplicity 1 one can introduce a normal form which is integrable and can be analyzed with great accuracy to obtain secondary tori. Unfortunately, it is well known that multiple resonances, that is, resonances of multiplicity greater or equal than 2, lead to normal forms that are not integrable and require other techniques to be analyzed (see [36, 37]).

In [15] the authors adapted the methods used in two and a half degrees of freedom to show instability in higher dimensions. The method consists in using the basic fact that multiple resonances happen in subsets of codimension greater than 1 in the space of actions and therefore the diffusing trajectories can contour them.

Now we mention some other approaches to the diffusion problem.

Geometric methods based on normally hyperbolic manifolds that use the separatrix map rather than the scattering map appear in [4, 57, 56, 58, 50, 51]. Other geometric methods have been applied in [21, 40, 12, 58, 29, 24].

Several authors have used variational methods, as well as combinations of variational and geometric methods, to obtain results on diffusion. This is the case, for example, in [48, 49, 9, 10, 8, 41, 42, 47, 3], where diffusion is obtained in various problems involving convex Hamiltonians of two and a half degrees of freedom.

Significant advances in the diffusing problem for two and a half degrees of freedom in the presence of *strong double resonances* can be found in [41, 42, 8, 47], and also in the announcement [49].

In higher dimensions, [2] deals with the case of a two dimensional normally hyperbolic manifold with arbitrarily many hyperbolic directions. A recent work [43] gives a detailed announcement of Arnold diffusion for three and a half degrees of freedom with a convex unperturbed Hamiltonian. We also note that [59] establishes diffusion far from *strong resonances*, using the method of the separatrix map. Other instability mechanisms in multi-dimensional settings have been studied in [61, 5].

We should also mention the paper [55] who suggests several other mechanisms that should be at play. It seems to be a very challenging problem to make rigorous the heuristic discussions on statistical and quantitative properties of different instability mechanisms in the heuristic literature [11, 44, 55].

The structure of this paper is as follows. In Section 2 we review some background on normally hyperbolic invariant manifolds, scattering map, and local coordinate systems near normally hyperbolic invariant manifolds. In Section 3 we provide two shadowing lemma type of results for normally hyperbolic invariant manifolds, Theorem 3.1 and Theorem 3.4, as well as some corollaries. We also describe a general result on the existence of diffusing orbits, Theorem 3.10. An application to establish the existence of diffusing orbits in a class of nearly integrable a priori unstable Hamiltonian systems that are multi-dimensional both in the center and in the hyperbolic directions is given in Section 4; the unperturbed system corresponds to a Hamiltonian which does not need to satisfy a convexity condition. Section 5 contains the proofs of the results stated in Section 3. An Appendix with definitions and tools that are utilized in the paper is included for the convenience of the reader.

2. Background

2.1. **Normally hyperbolic invariant manifolds and scattering maps.** We consider a discrete dynamical system given by a C^r-smooth map f on a compact, C^r-smooth manifold M, of dimension m, where $r \geq 1$.

Assume that Λ is a normally hyperbolic invariant manifold (NHIM) in M, of dimension n_c: this means that the tangent bundle of M restricted to Λ splits as a Whitney sum of sub-bundles $TM_{|\Lambda} = T\Lambda \oplus E^u \oplus E^s$ which are invariant under Df, and that $(Df)_{|E^u}$ expands more than $(Df)_{|T\Lambda}$, while $(Df)_{|E^s}$ contracts more than $(Df)_{|T\Lambda}$. The rather standard definition is given in Appendix 5.5, Subsection A.

In the sequel we assume that the stable and unstable bundles associated to the normally hyperbolic structure have dimensions $n_u, n_s > 0$, respectively, where $m = n_c + n_u + n_s$. (In many applications concerning diffusion in nearly integrable Hamiltonian systems we have $n_u = n_s = n$ and $n_c =$ even number, so $m =$ even number.)

The normal hyperbolicity of Λ implies that there exist stable and unstable manifolds $W^s(\Lambda)$, $W^u(\Lambda)$ of Λ. The exponential contraction and expansion rates of Df along the stable and unstable bundles, respectively, together with the exponential contraction and expansion rates of Df on $T\Lambda$, determine an integer ℓ with $0 < \ell \leq r$, such that Λ, $W^s(\Lambda)$, $W^u(\Lambda)$ are C^ℓ-smooth.

From now on we assume that r and the normally hyperbolic structure are so that $\ell \geq 2$.

The stable and unstable manifolds $W^s(\Lambda)$, $W^u(\Lambda)$ are foliated by stable and unstable manifolds of points $W^s(x)$, $W^u(x)$, respectively, with $x \in \Lambda$, which are C^r-smooth 1-dimensional manifolds; the corresponding foliations are $C^{\ell-1}$-smooth. See Appendix A.

Let $\Gamma \subseteq W^s(\Lambda) \cap W^u(\Lambda)$ be a compact, $C^{\ell-1}$-smooth homoclinic manifold. Consider the wave maps

$$\Omega^- : \Gamma \subset W^u(\Lambda) \to \Omega^-(\Gamma) \subseteq \Lambda,\ \Omega^-(x) = x^-, \tag{2.1}$$

$$\Omega^+ : \Gamma \subset W^s(\Lambda) \to \Omega^+(\Gamma) \subseteq \Lambda,\ \Omega^+(x) = x^+, \tag{2.2}$$

where x^- is the unique point in Λ such that $x \in W^u(x^-)$, and x^+ is the unique point in Λ such that $x \in W^u(x^+)$. These maps are C^ℓ smooth.

Under certain restrictions on Γ, which are given explicitly in Appendix A, the wave maps $\Omega^\pm$ restricted to Γ are $C^{\ell-1}$-diffeomorphisms. Such a homoclinic manifold is referred to as a homoclinic channel.

Assuming that Γ is a homoclinic channel, one can define a $C^{\ell-1}$ diffeomorphism $\sigma : \Omega^-(\Gamma) \to \Omega^+(\Gamma)$ given by $\sigma = \Omega^+ \circ (\Omega^-)^{-1}$, where $\Omega^-(\Gamma), \Omega^+(\Gamma)$ are open sets in Λ. That is, $\sigma(x^-) = x^+$, for $x^- \in \Omega^-(\Gamma)$. The mapping σ is referred to as the scattering map associated to the homoclinic channel Γ. For details on this set-up and general properties of the scattering map see Appendix 5.5, Subsection A.

We shall note that there is no actual trajectory of the system that goes from x^- to $\sigma(x^-) = x^+$. Rather, the geometric object that corresponds to $\sigma(x^-) = x^+$ is the homoclinic orbit $\{f^n(x)\}_{n\in\mathbb{Z}}$ of x, which approaches asymptotically $f^n(x^+)$ forward in time, as $n \to +\infty$, and approaches asymptotically $f^n(x^-)$ backwards in time, as $n \to -\infty$.

We remark that, if we denote by σ^Γ the scattering map associated to the homoclinic channel Γ, then for each $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, $f^k(\Gamma)$ is also a homoclinic channel, and the corresponding scattering map $\sigma^{f^k(\Gamma)}$ is related to σ^Γ by the following relation

$$\sigma^{f^k(\Gamma)} = f^k \circ \sigma^\Gamma \circ f^{-k}. \tag{2.3}$$

While σ^Γ and $\sigma^{f^k(\Gamma)}$ are technically different scattering maps, they are geometrically the same, as they are defined via the same homoclinic channel (up to iterations by the map f). Of course, one can have geometrically different scattering maps σ^Γ, $\sigma^{\Gamma'}$, provided that $f^k(\Gamma) \cap \Gamma' = \emptyset$ for all k, where Γ, Γ' denote the underlying homoclinic channels.

In many examples, the scattering map can be computed explicitly via perturbation theory [19, 14, 22], or numerically [6, 17, 18, 7].

2.2. **Normally hyperbolic invariant manifolds and scattering maps in a perturbative setting.** Assume now that (M, ω) is a symplectic manifold, and $f_\varepsilon : M \to M$ is a C^r-family of symplectic maps, where $\varepsilon \in (\varepsilon_0, \varepsilon_0)$, for some $\varepsilon_0 > 0$.

For example, one can think of f_ε as being the time-1 map associated to the Hamiltonian flow $\phi_{t,\varepsilon}$ corresponding to a Hamiltonian $H_\varepsilon : M \to \mathbb{R}$ of the form $H_\varepsilon = H_0 + \varepsilon H_1$, where H_0 is an integrable Hamiltonian; in this case the maps f_ε with $\varepsilon \neq 0$ can be viewed as ε-perturbations of the map f_0, which is the time-1 map for the unperturbed Hamiltonian H_0.

Assume that there exists a normally hyperbolic invariant manifold $\Lambda_\varepsilon \subseteq M$ for f_ε, of even dimension n_c, for all $\varepsilon \in (-\varepsilon_0, \varepsilon_0)$, and that $\dim W^u(\Lambda_\varepsilon) = n_c + n_u = \dim W^s(\Lambda_\varepsilon) = n_c + n_s$. Assume that Λ_ε is symplectic; we denote by J the almost complex structure associated to $\omega_{|\Lambda_\varepsilon}$. Then the map f_ε is also symplectic on Λ_ε.

If for each $\varepsilon \in (-\varepsilon_0, \varepsilon_0)$ there exists a homoclinic channel Γ_ε for f_ε, then the scattering map $\sigma_\varepsilon : \Omega^-(\Gamma_\varepsilon) \to \Omega^-(\Gamma_\varepsilon)$ is also symplectic (see [23, 25]).

Now we assume that there exists a 'reference' manifold Λ, such that each Λ_ε, can be parametrized via a C^ℓ parametrization $k_\varepsilon : \Lambda \to \Lambda_\varepsilon$, for $\varepsilon \in (-\varepsilon_0, \varepsilon_0)$. This happens, for example, if $\Lambda = \Lambda_0$ is a normally hyperbolic manifold for the unperturbed map f_0, and the Λ_ε's, $\varepsilon \neq 0$, are obtained by the persistence of normal hyperbolicity under sufficiently small perturbations.

We can define a new system of coordinates in a neighborhood V_{Λ_ε} of Λ_ε in M, defined by the C^ℓ-diffeomorphism $h_\varepsilon : U_\Lambda \to V_{\Lambda_\varepsilon}$, where U_Λ is a neighborhood of the zero section of $(E^u \oplus E^s)_{|\Lambda}$, given by

$$h_\varepsilon(x, v^u, v^s) = \exp_{k_\varepsilon(x)}(v^u + v^s). \tag{2.4}$$

Note that $h_\varepsilon(x, 0, 0) = \exp_{k_\varepsilon(x)}(0) = k_\varepsilon(x) \in \Lambda_\varepsilon$, hence $(h_\varepsilon)_{|\Lambda} = k_\varepsilon$.

Via the parametrizations h_ε, each map f_ε induces a map $\tilde{f}_\varepsilon$ on U_Λ by

$$\tilde{f}_\varepsilon = h_\varepsilon^{-1} \circ f_\varepsilon \circ h_\varepsilon.$$

In particular, $(\tilde{f}_\varepsilon)_{|\Lambda} = k_\varepsilon^{-1} \circ (f_\varepsilon)_{|\Lambda_\varepsilon} \circ k_\varepsilon$.

The scattering map $\sigma_\varepsilon : \Omega^-(\Gamma_\varepsilon) \subset \Lambda_\varepsilon \to \Omega^+(\Gamma_\varepsilon) \subset \Lambda_\varepsilon$ can also be expressed in terms of the reference manifold Λ by

$$\tilde{\sigma}_\varepsilon : k_\varepsilon^{-1}(\Omega^-(\Gamma_\varepsilon)) \subset \Lambda \to k_\varepsilon^{-1}(\Omega^+(\Gamma_\varepsilon)) \subset \Lambda$$

given by

$$\tilde{\sigma}_\varepsilon = k_\varepsilon^{-1} \circ \sigma_\varepsilon \circ k_\varepsilon.$$

We will refer to the map $\tilde{\sigma}_\varepsilon$ also as the 'scattering map'.

In this perturbative setting one also has an unperturbed scattering map σ_0 in the unperturbed manifold $\Lambda_0 = \Lambda$, associated to the homoclinic channel Γ_0 contained in the intersection between the stable and unstable manifolds of Λ. Of course, in this unperturbed setting one has: $\tilde{\sigma}_0 = k_0^{-1} \circ \sigma_0 \circ k_0 = \sigma_0$.

For Hamiltonian systems H_ε as described at the beginning of the section, in [23] there is a perturbative formula for the scattering map:

$$\tilde{\sigma}_\varepsilon = \tilde{\sigma}_0 + \mu(\varepsilon) J \nabla S \circ \tilde{\sigma}_0 + o(\mu(\varepsilon))^1, \tag{2.5}$$

[1]Here by $o(\mu(\varepsilon))$ we mean that $\lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} [\tilde{\sigma}_\varepsilon - (\tilde{\sigma}_0 + \mu(\varepsilon) J \nabla S \circ \tilde{\sigma}_0)]/\mu(\varepsilon) = 0$.

where S is some real valued C^ℓ-function on Λ, and $\mu(\varepsilon)$ is some positive C^ℓ-function defined on $(-\varepsilon_0, \varepsilon_0)$ with $\mu(0) = 0$.

The function S can be computed explicitly in terms of convergent integrals of the perturbation evaluated along homoclinic trajectories of the unperturbed system (see [23]):

$$\begin{aligned} S(x) = \lim_{T\to+\infty} \int_{-T}^{0} & \frac{dH_\varepsilon}{d\varepsilon}_{|\varepsilon=0} \circ \phi_t \circ \left(\Omega_-^{\Gamma_0}\right)^{-1} \circ \sigma_0^{-1} \circ k_0(x) \\ & - \frac{dH_\varepsilon}{d\varepsilon}_{|\varepsilon=0} \circ \phi_t \circ \sigma_0^{-1} \circ k_0(x) dt \\ + \lim_{T\to+\infty} \int_{0}^{T} & \frac{dH_\varepsilon}{d\varepsilon}_{|\varepsilon=0} \circ \phi_t \circ \left(\Omega_+^{\Gamma_0}\right)^{-1} \circ k_0(x) \\ & - \frac{dH_\varepsilon}{d\varepsilon}_{|\varepsilon=0} \circ \phi_t \circ k_0(x) dt. \end{aligned} \tag{2.6}$$

Here ϕ_t is the flow corresponding to the unperturbed Hamiltonian H_0.

In some cases it is possible that, when $\varepsilon = 0$, the stable and unstable manifolds of Λ_0 coincide, i.e., $W^u(\Lambda_0) = W^s(\Lambda_0)$. In these cases, one usually uses first order perturbation theory to establish the splitting of the manifolds. Using an adapted Melnikov method, in [14] it is shown that, under appropriate conditions, for $0 < |\varepsilon| \ll 1$, one can find transverse intersections along a manifold Γ_ε which extends smoothly to a homoclinic manifold Γ_0 as $\varepsilon \to 0$. While the limiting manifold Γ_0 is not a transverse intersection, the scattering map σ_ε depends smoothly on ε and extends smoothly to a well defined map σ_0. In many examples $\sigma_0 = \mathrm{Id}$ and $\mu(\varepsilon) = \varepsilon$. This special situation will be considered in Section 4, where a more explicit formula for the function $S(x)$ is given in terms of the so-called Melnikov potential.

3. Shadowing lemmas

The aim of this section is twofold: to formulate several shadowing lemmas in normally hyperbolic invariant manifolds, and to provide a master theorem, based on these shadowing lemmas, that guarantees the existence of diffusing orbits under some general framework.

3.1. **Shadowing of pseudo-orbits obtained by interspersing the inner dynamics with a single scattering map.**

In the setting of the Subsection 2.1, one obtains two maps defined on Λ or on some some sub-domain of it: the scattering map σ (the outer dynamics), and the restriction of f to Λ (the inner dynamics). In principle, one can act on Λ by applying either map in any succession, however this does not yield true orbits of the system but only pseudo-orbits.

The first key result of this paper is a rather general shadowing lemma type of result. It says that for every pseudo-orbit obtained by alternately applying a single scattering map and some power of the inner map (given by the restriction of f to Λ), there exists a true orbit of the system that follows closely that pseudo-orbit. The pseudo-orbits

considered here are of the form $y_{i+1} = f^{m_i} \circ \sigma \circ f^{n_i}(y_i)$. [2] The orders m_i, n_i of the iterates need to be chosen sufficiently large, uniformly lower bounded with respect to i. The resulting shadowing orbits are of the form $z_{i+1} = f^{n_i+m_i}(z_i)$. Intuitively, m_i, n_i quantify the lengths of time for which we follow a homoclinic trajectory, associated to an application of the scattering map, forward, and respectively backwards, in time, from some point in Γ to a neighborhood of Λ.

Theorem 3.1 (Shadowing Lemma for Pseudo-Orbits the Scattering Map and the Inner Dynamics)**.** *Assume that $f : M \to M$ is a sufficiently smooth map, $\Lambda \subseteq M$ is a normally hyperbolic invariant manifold, $\Gamma \subseteq M$ is an homoclinic channel, and σ is the scattering map associated to Γ.*

Then, for every $\delta > 0$ there exists $N > 0$ such that for every sequence of points $\{y_i\}_{i\geq 0}$ in Λ of the form $y_{i+1} = f^{m_i} \circ \sigma \circ f^{n_i}(y_i)$, with $m_i, n_i \geq N$, there exists an orbit $\{z_i\}_{i\geq 0}$ of f in M, with $z_{i+1} = f^{m_i+n_i}(z_i)$, such that $d(z_i, y_i) < \delta$ for all $i \geq 0$.

The value of N depends on δ but also on the hyperbolic structure, and in particular on the angle of intersection between $W^u(\Lambda)$ with $W^s(\Lambda)$. The proof of this result is given in Subsection 5.2.

The next key result says that, if the inner dynamics satisfies some recurrence condition, then for every pseudo-orbit of the scattering map there exists a true orbit of the system that approximately follows it.

Note that Theorem 3.1 does not use any symplectic structure. It is valid for general maps. Hence, the results obtained from it remain valid for dissipative perturbations of Hamiltonian systems. Of course, when the perturbations are Hamiltonian we can obtain stronger results. Let's recall here the definition of recurrent points and the Poincaré recurrence theorem.

Definition 3.2. A point $x \in \Lambda$ is said to be recurrent for a map f on Λ, if for every open neighborhood $U \subseteq \Lambda$ of x, $f^k(x) \in U$ for some $k > 0$ large enough.

Theorem 3.3 (Poincaré recurrence theorem)**.** *Suppose that μ is a measure on Λ, f is μ-preserving on Λ, and $D \subset \Lambda$ is f-invariant and $\mu(D) < \infty$. Then μ-almost every point of D is recurrent.*

The main result of this section is:

Theorem 3.4 (Shadowing Lemma for Orbits of the Scattering Map)**.** *Assume that $f : M \to M$ is a sufficiently smooth map, $\Lambda \subseteq M$ is a normally hyperbolic invariant manifold, $\Gamma \subseteq M$ is an homoclinic channel, and σ is the scattering map associated to Γ.*

Assume that f preserves a measure absolutely continuous with respect to the Lebesgue measure on Λ and that σ is absolutely continuous. Let $\{x_i\}_{i=0,\dots,n}$ be a finite pseudo-orbit of the scattering map in Λ, i.e., $x_{i+1} = \sigma(x_i)$ for $i = 0, \dots, n-1$, for some integer

[2]Note that we use the term pseudo-orbit in a sense different from the classical one, that is, an ε-pseudo-orbit being a sequence of points $\{x_i\}$ with the property that $d(f(x_i), x_{i+1}) < \varepsilon$ for all i. Our pseudo-orbits are in fact orbits of the iterated function system, or polysystem, $\{\sigma, f\}$, see also [46]. Here we call them pseudo-orbits to distinguish them from the true orbits of f.

n. Assume that the set $\{x_i\}_{i=0,\dots,n}$ has a neighborhood $\mathcal{U} \subseteq \Lambda$ with almost every point of $\mathcal{U}$ recurrent for $f_{|\Lambda}$.[3]

Then, for every $\delta > 0$ there exists an orbit $\{z_i\}_{i=0,\dots,n}$ of f in M, with $z_{i+1} = f^{k_i}(z_i)$ for some $k_i > 0$, such that $d(z_i, x_i) < \delta$ for all $i = 0, \dots, n$.

The proof of this result, given in Subsection 5, uses a given pseudo-orbit of the scattering map and the recurrence property of the inner dynamics to produce another pseudo-orbit that intertwines the scattering map and the inner dynamics. Then Theorem 3.1 yields a true orbit of the system.

Some immediate extensions of Theorem 3.1 and Theorem 3.4 when several scattering maps are considered rather than a single one are given in Subsection 3.2. We also note that a result closely related to Theorem 3.1 appears in [18].

To apply Theorem 3.4, one needs to find orbits of the scattering map that follow desired itineraries. For example, one may wish to find a pseudo-orbit of the scattering map that travels some 'large distance' in Λ. If such a pseudo-orbit is found, Theorem 3.4 yields a true orbit that also travels the same large distance. Also, if the scattering map exhibits symbolic dynamics, then the true dynamics also exhibits symbolic dynamics.

We emphasize that Theorem 3.4 is very general, as the requirements on the scattering map and on the inner dynamics are automatically satisfied in many situations. If M is endowed with a symplectic form ω, $\omega_{|\Lambda}$ is symplectic, and f is also symplectic, then $f_{|\Lambda}$ is symplectic and the scattering map σ is also symplectic. See [23].

We have the following remarkable dichotomy. Assume that the scattering map has pseudo-orbits that travel a long distance within some region. Then either:

I. The inner map $f_{|\Lambda}$ has an invariant set of finite measure containing the region where the pseudo-orbits of the scattering map travel a long distance. Then there is Poincaré Recurrence on that set and we can apply Theorem 3.4, leading to the existence of orbits which travel a long distance: we encounter the instability phenomenon.

II. There is no finite measure set in Λ that is invariant under $f_{|\Lambda}$. Hence we have orbits of f traveling long distances and therefore we obtain instability by the inner map $f_{|\Lambda}$ alone.

On both branches of the alternative we obtain unstable orbits.

A precise illustration of this dichotomy is given by Corollary 3.11.

Note that in Theorem 3.4 we do not require that Λ is a 2-dimensional annulus and/or f is a twist map, which seem to be essential conditions in many other works. We note that non-twist maps have regions where standard methods such as KAM theory and Aubry-Mather theory do not apply (see [13, 19]).

3.2. **Shadowing of pseudo-orbits obtained by interspersing the inner dynamics with multiple scattering maps.** The results in Subsection 3.1 extend naturally to the case of several scattering maps rather than a single one. We note that, in general, one has an abundance of homoclinic orbits; the Smale-Birkhoff Homoclinic Orbit Theorem asserts that the existence of a single transverse homoclinic orbit implies the

[3]The points $\{x_i\}_{i=0,\dots,n}$ do not have to be themselves recurrent.

existence of infinitely many transverse homoclinic orbits that are geometrically distinct. Thus one is able to define many scattering maps.

Suppose that there exists a finite collection of homoclinic channels $\Gamma_j \subseteq M$, for $j \in \{1, \ldots, L\}$, for some positive integer L. Let $\sigma_j : \Omega^-(\Gamma_j) \to \Omega^+(\Gamma_j)$ be the scattering map associated to Γ_j, for $j \in \{1, \ldots, L\}$.

Corollary 3.5. *Assume that $f : M \to M$, $\Lambda \subseteq M$ and $\Gamma_j \subseteq M$ are as above, and σ_j is the scattering map corresponding to the homoclinic channel Γ_j, for $j \in \{1, \ldots, L\}$. Then, for every $\delta > 0$ there exists $N > 0$ such that for every sequence of points $\{y_i\}_{i\geq 0}$ in Λ of the form $y_{i+1} = f^{m_i} \circ \sigma_{\alpha_i} \circ f^{n_i}(y_i)$, with $m_i, n_i \geq N$, and $\alpha_i \in \{1, \ldots, L\}$, there exists an orbit $\{z_i\}_{i\geq 0}$ of f in M, with $z_{i+1} = f^{m_i+n_i}(z_i)$, such that $d(z_i, y_i) < \delta$ for all $i \geq 0$.*

As a consequence of this result, we have:

Corollary 3.6. *Assume that $f : M \to M$, $\Lambda \subseteq M$ and $\Gamma_j \subseteq M$ are as above, and σ_j is the scattering map corresponding to the homoclinic channel Γ_j, for $j \in \{1, \ldots, L\}$. Assume that f preserves a measure absolutely continuous with respect to the Lebesgue measure on Λ and that each σ_j is absolutely continuous. Let $\{x_i\}_{i=0,\ldots,n}$ be a finite sequence of points of the form $x_{i+1} = \sigma_{\alpha_i}(x_i)$ in Λ, where $\alpha_i \in \{1, \ldots, L\}$, for $i \geq 0$. Assume that the set $\{x_i\}_{i=0,\ldots,n}$ has a neighborhood $\mathcal{U} \subseteq \Lambda$ with almost all points of $\mathcal{U}$ recurrent for $f_{|\Lambda}$. Then, for every $\delta > 0$ there exists an orbit $\{z_i\}_{i=0,\ldots,n}$ of f in M, with $z_{i+1} = f^{k_i}(z_i)$ for some $k_i > 0$, such that $d(z_i, x_i) < \delta$ for all $i = 0, \ldots, n$.*

Remark 3.7. In applications, using several scattering maps rather than one can be very advantageous. In astrodynamics, for example, the existence of multiple homoclinic intersections can be exploited to increase the versatility of space missions. See, e.g., [7, 17].

Remark 3.8. Using several scattering maps can also be useful to prove diffusion in generic systems. In some perturbative problems, e.g., as in Subsection 4, the scattering map can be computed in terms of convergent integrals of the perturbation evaluated along a homoclinic of the unperturbed system. One can ensure that the scattering map has non-trivial effects by verifying that such an integral is non-zero. Thus, given a perturbation, one can slightly modify it, using a bump function supported in some tubular neighborhood of the homoclinic, to obtain a nearby perturbation for which the corresponding scattering map exhibits the desired non-trivial effects. Having available multiple homoclinics one can use bump functions supported in disjoint tubular neighborhoods of each of these homoclinics to obtain multiple scattering maps that exhibit different types of non-trivial behaviors. See, e.g., [33].

Remark 3.9. The results above also generalize to the case of several normally hyperbolic invariant manifolds. If $\Gamma \subseteq W^u_{\Lambda_1} \cap W^s_{\Lambda_2}$ is a homoclinic channel between two normally hyperbolic invariant manifolds Λ_1, Λ_2, we can define a scattering map $\sigma^\Gamma : \Omega^-(\Gamma) \subseteq \Lambda_1 \to \Lambda_2$ in a similar fashion to Appendix A. If we are given a chain of manifolds Λ_i, $i = 1, \ldots, n$ and scattering maps $\sigma^i : \Omega^-(\Gamma_i) \subseteq \Lambda_i \to \Lambda_{i+1}$, $i = 1, \ldots, n-1$, then we can shadow orbits of the form $y_{i+1} = f^{m_i}_{|\Lambda_{i+1}} \circ \sigma^i \circ f^{n_i}_{|\Lambda_i}(y_i)$, with $y_i \in \Lambda_i$ and

$y_{i+1} \in \Lambda_{i+1}$, $i = 1, \dots, n-1$. Such scattering maps appear in the study of double resonances [49, 2, 41, 42]. We hope to come back to this problem.

Another problem where one has scattering maps between two different normally hyperbolic invariant manifolds is the problem of two rocking blocks under periodic forcing [35].

3.3. **A qualitative mechanism of diffusion in nearly integrable Hamiltonian systems.** We now describe several situations when we can construct pseudo-orbits of the scattering map that travel a significant distance in the normally hyperbolic invariant manifold, and so Theorem 3.4 can be applied to obtain true orbits nearby. More concrete conditions that yield such orbits in some concrete examples appear in Section 4.

We consider the perturbative setting described in Subsection 2.2, where $f_\varepsilon : M \to M$, $\varepsilon \in (\varepsilon_0, \varepsilon_0)$, is family of symplectic maps, $\Lambda_\varepsilon \subseteq M$ is a normally hyperbolic invariant manifold for f_ε, Γ_ε is a homoclinic channel for f_ε and $\sigma_\varepsilon : \Omega^-(\Gamma_\varepsilon) \to \Omega^-(\Gamma_\varepsilon)$ is the corresponding scattering map. We assume that Λ_ε is described via a parametrization $k_\varepsilon : \Lambda \to \Lambda_\varepsilon$, and $(\tilde{f}_\varepsilon)_{|\Lambda} = k_\varepsilon^{-1} \circ (f_\varepsilon)_{|\Lambda_\varepsilon} \circ k_\varepsilon$, $\tilde{\sigma}_\varepsilon = k_\varepsilon^{-1} \circ \sigma_\varepsilon \circ k_\varepsilon$. We also assume that $\Lambda = B^d \times \mathbb{T}^d$, and that we have a system of action-angle coordinates (I, ϕ) on Λ with $I \in B^d$ and $\phi \in \mathbb{T}^d$, where $B^d \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ is a disk in $\mathbb{R}^d$, including the possibility $B^d = \mathbb{R}^d$. Here $\mathbb{T}^d = \mathbb{R}^d/\mathbb{Z}^d$.

We recall the perturbative formula for the scattering map (2.5), and we assume that $\tilde{\sigma}_0 = \mathrm{Id}$.

Theorem 3.10. *Assume that for all $\varepsilon \in (-\varepsilon_0, \varepsilon_0)$, there exists a scattering map σ_ε, such that*

$$\tilde{\sigma}_\varepsilon = \mathrm{Id} + \mu(\varepsilon) J \nabla S + o(\mu(\varepsilon)) \tag{3.1}$$

where $\tilde{\sigma}_\varepsilon = k_\varepsilon^{-1} \circ \sigma_\varepsilon \circ k_\varepsilon$, S is some real valued C^ℓ-function on Λ, and $\mu(\varepsilon)$ is some positive C^ℓ-function defined on $(-\varepsilon_0, \varepsilon_0)$ with $\mu(0) = 0$.

Assume that $J\nabla S(\tilde{x}_0) \neq 0$ at some point $\tilde{x}_0 \in \Lambda$.

Let $\tilde{\gamma} : [0,1] \to \Lambda$ be a solution curve for the vector field $J\nabla S$ through $\tilde{x}_0$, and assume that there exists a neighborhood $\mathcal{U}_{\tilde{\gamma}}$ of $\tilde{\gamma}([0,1])$ in Λ such that a.e. point $x \in \mathcal{U}_{\tilde{\gamma}}$ is recurrent for $\tilde{f}_{\varepsilon|\Lambda}$. Let $\gamma_\varepsilon = k_\varepsilon \circ \tilde{\gamma}$, the corresponding curve in Λ_ε.

There exists $\varepsilon_1 > 0$ sufficiently small, and a constant $K > 0$, such that for every $\varepsilon \in (-\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_1) \setminus \{0\}$ and every $\delta > 0$, there exists an orbit $\{z_i\}_{i=0,\dots,n}$ of f_ε in M, with $z_{i+1} = f_\varepsilon^{k_i}(z_i)$, for some $k_i > 0$, and a sequence of times $t_i = i\mu(\varepsilon)$, $0 = t_0 < t_1 < \dots < t_n \leq 1$, for $n = \mathrm{E}(\frac{1}{\mu(\varepsilon)}) > 0$[4], such that

$$d(z_i, \gamma_\varepsilon(t_i)) < \delta + K\mu(\varepsilon), \qquad \text{for } i = 0, \dots, n.$$

The function $\mu(\varepsilon)$ is associated to the size of the splitting of $W^u(\Lambda)$, $W^s(\Lambda)$. In the example of an a priori unstable system in Section 4, we have $\mu(\varepsilon) = \varepsilon$. This is not usually the case in the so-called "a priori stable" systems, where the unperturbed system is completely integrable without any hyperbolic structure. In those cases, the a priori unstable structure appears after some first order partial averaging near simple

[4]Here by $E(x)$ we denote the floor function of x, i.e., the largest integer not greater than x.

resonances and therefore the homoclinic channel that gives rise to the scattering map is ε-dependent and makes the splitting between the stable and unstable manifolds to behave in a non expected way respect to the perturbative parameter: we face in these cases the so-called exponentially small splitting of separatrices if the system is analytic and therefore $\mu(\varepsilon) = O(\varepsilon^p \exp(-q\varepsilon^{-r}))$, for some $p, q, r \in \mathbb{Q}$ as in [1]. If the system is only smooth one expects $\mu(\varepsilon) = \varepsilon^p$, $p \geq 2$.

We will refer to a solution curve $\tilde{\gamma}$ in Λ as in the statement of Theorem 3.10, or to its corresponding curve $\gamma_\varepsilon = k_\varepsilon(\tilde{\gamma})$ in Λ_ε, as a 'scattering path', as it represents an approximation of an orbit of the scattering map. See Fig. 2. So the previous result can be stated that, given any scattering path, there exits a true orbit of the system that follows it closely. As one can typically find a scattering path for which the action variable changes by some positive distance independent of ε, hence one can find a true orbit for which the action variable changes by $O(1)$; this is stated precisely in the following corollary.

We consider a neighborhood V_{Λ_ε} on which there is a system of coordinates $h_\varepsilon : U_\Lambda \to V_{\Lambda_\varepsilon}$ as described in (2.4) of Subsection 2.2. To any point $z \in V_{\Lambda_\varepsilon}$ we can associate a point $(x, v^u, v^s) \in U_\Lambda$, such that $z = h_\varepsilon(x, v^u, v^s)$; we denote by $I(z)$ the I-coordinate of the corresponding point $x \in \Lambda$.

Corollary 3.11. *Assume that a scattering map σ_ε as in Theorem 3.10 is given. If $J\nabla S$ is transverse to some level set $\{I = I_*\}$ in Λ at some point (I_*, ϕ_*), then there exist $0 < \varepsilon_1 < \varepsilon_0$ and $\rho > 0$, such that for every $0 < \varepsilon < \varepsilon_1$ there exists an orbit $\{z_i\}_{i=0,\dots,n}$ of f_ε, such that*

$$\|I(z_n) - I(z_0)\| > \rho.$$

Remark 3.12. We note that, in order to obtain a trajectory that achieves a change in the I-variable of order $O(1)$ the scattering map needs to be applied $n = O(1/\mu(\varepsilon))$ times. However, the true orbit that achieves the $O(1)$-change in the I-variable also follows not only the scattering map but also some recursive orbit segments of the inner dynamics, as in the proof of Theorem 3.4. Since these recursive orbit segments of the inner dynamics are obtained by invoking the Poincaré recurrence theorem, this result does not give an estimate for the time required to follow the inner dynamics, hence does not directly lead to an estimate on the diffusion time. However, there are situations in which one is able to estimate the recurrence time; see Remark 4.3.

4. Existence of diffusing trajectories in nearly integrable a priori unstable Hamiltonian systems

As an application, we show the existence of diffusing orbits in a large class of nearly integrable a priori unstable Hamiltonian systems that are multi-dimensional both in the center and in the hyperbolic directions. The model below is an extension of those considered in [14, 26, 16].

Let

$$H_\varepsilon(p, q, I, \phi, t) = h_0(I) + \sum_{i=1}^{n} \pm \left(\frac{1}{2} p_i^2 + V_i(q_i) \right) + \varepsilon H_1(p, q, I, \phi, t; \varepsilon). \tag{4.1}$$

where $(p, q, I, \phi, t) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{T}^n \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{T}^d \times \mathbb{T}^1$.

We make the following assumptions:

(A1.) h_0, H_1 and V_i, $i = 1, \dots, n$ are uniformly C^r for some r sufficiently large.

(A2.) Each potential $V_i : \mathbb{T}^n \to \mathbb{R}$, $i = 1, \dots, n$, is 1-periodic in q_i and has a non-degenerate global maximum at 0, and hence each pendulum $\pm\left(\frac{1}{2}p_i^2 + V_i(q_i)\right)$ has a homoclinic orbit to $(0,0)$, which we denote by $(p_i^0(t), q_i^0(t))$, $t \in \mathbb{R}$.

(A3.) The perturbation H_1 is 1-periodic in t and satisfies some explicit non-degeneracy condition as described below.

Let $\Lambda_0 = \{(p, q, I, \phi) \,|\, p = q = 0\}$. Thus there is a family of homoclinic orbits for the whole system of penduli given by

$$(p^0(\tau + t\bar{1}), q^0(\tau + t\bar{1})) = (p_1^0(\tau_1 + t), \dots, p_n^0(\tau_n + t), q_1^0(\tau_1 + t), \dots, q_n^0(\tau_n + t)),$$

where $\tau = (\tau_1, \dots, \tau_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$, with the parameters $\tau_1, \dots, \tau_n$ representing the initial phases of the individual penduli and where $\bar{1} = (1, \dots, 1) \in \mathbb{R}^n$.

Let $\Gamma_0 \subseteq \{(p^0(\tau), q^0(\tau), I, \phi) \,|\, \tau \in \mathbb{R}^n, I \in \mathbb{R}^d, \phi \in \mathbb{T}^d\}$ be a homoclinic manifold for which we can define a scattering map σ_0 on Λ_0.

Consider the Poincaré function (or Melnikov potential) associated to the homoclinic manifold Γ_0:

$$\begin{aligned} L(\tau, I, \phi, s) = -\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \big[& H_1(p^0(\tau + t\bar{1}), q^0(\tau + t\bar{1}), I, \phi + \omega(I)t, s + t; 0) \\ & - H_1(0, 0, I, \phi + \omega(I)t, s + t; 0)\big]\, dt. \end{aligned} \tag{4.2}$$

where $\omega(I) = \partial h_0 / \partial I$.

– Assume that there exists a set $U^- := \mathcal{I} \times \mathcal{J} \subset \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{T}^{d+1}$, such that, for any values $(I, \phi, s) \in U^-$, the map

$$\tau \in \mathbb{R}^n \to L(\tau, I, \phi, s) \in \mathbb{R}$$

has a non-degenerate critical point τ^*, which is locally given, by the implicit function theorem by

$$\tau^* = \tau^*(I, \phi, s).$$

– Define the auxiliary functions

$$\mathcal{L}(I, \phi, s) = L(\tau^*(I, \phi, s), I, \phi, s), \quad \mathcal{L}^*(I, \theta) = \mathcal{L}(I, \theta, 0). \tag{4.3}$$

Assume that the reduced Poincaré function $\mathcal{L}^*(I, \theta)$ satisfies that $J\nabla\mathcal{L}^*(I, \theta)$ is transverse to the level set $\{I = I_*\}$ at some point $(I_*, \theta_*) = (I_*, \phi_* - \omega(I_*)s)$, such that $(I_*, \phi_*, s) \in U^-$. That is:

$$\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}^*}{\partial \theta}(I^*, \theta^*) \neq 0. \tag{4.4}$$

We note that the integral in (4.2) is similar to that in (2.6), as it concerns the average effect of the perturbation H_1 on a homoclinic orbit Γ_0 of the unperturbed system.

Theorem 4.1. *Assuming the conditions A1-A3, there exists $\varepsilon_0 > 0$, and $\rho > 0$ such that, for each $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0)$, there exists a trajectory $x(t)$ of the Hamiltonian flow and $T > 0$ such that*

$$\|I(x(T)) - I(x(0))\| > \rho.$$

The above result states that, for all small enough regular perturbations satisfying (4.4), there exist trajectories that travel $O(1)$ with respect to the I-coordinate, that is, they travel a distance relative to the I-coordinate that is independent of the size of the perturbation. This phenomenon is often referred to as Arnold diffusion.

There are some significant differences from the main results of [14, 26, 16]:

- Both the phase space of h_0 and that of the system of penduli are multi-dimensional, unlike in [14, 26];
- We do not assume a convexity condition on the unperturbed Hamiltonian $H_0(I, \phi, p, q) = h_0(I) + \sum_{i=1,\dots,n} \pm(p_i^2/2 + V_i(q_i))$, so variational methods do not generally apply. We do not assume that h_0 satisfies a non-degeneracy condition that $I \mapsto \partial h_0/\partial I$ is a diffeomorphism, or a convexity condition that $\partial^2 h_0/\partial I_i \partial I_j$ is strictly positive definite. In the lack of such conditions, one cannot apply the KAM theorem, hence cannot construct transition chains of KAM tori as in [14, 26, 16]. Also, Aubry-Mather theory does not apply as in [31].
- We do not assume that H_1 is a trigonometric polynomial as in [14, 16]. Moreover, we note that condition (A3) is satisfied by a C^r open and dense set of perturbations H_1.

From now on, we make the following notation convention. When we will say that some error term is bounded by a constant, or by $O(\varepsilon^a)$, or by $O(\varepsilon^a \ln(\varepsilon^b))$ we will mean uniformly on some compact set.

Proof of Theorem 4.1. We describe the geometric structures that organize the dynamics, following [14, 16]. We emphasize that, once the geometric set-up is laid out, the dynamics argument to show the existence of diffusing orbits is very different.

The time-dependent Hamiltonian in (4.1) is transformed into an autonomous Hamiltonian by introducing a new variable A, symplectically conjugate with t obtaining the $n + d + 1$ degrees of freedom Hamiltonian system

$$\tilde{H}_\varepsilon(p, q, I, \phi, A, t) = h_0(I) + \sum_{i=1}^{n} \pm \left(\frac{1}{2} p_i^2 + V_i(q_i) \right) + A + \varepsilon H_1(p, q, I, \phi, t; \varepsilon). \tag{4.5}$$

We fix an energy manifold $\{\tilde{H}_\varepsilon = \tilde{h}\}$ for some $\tilde{h}$, and restrict to a Poincaré section $\{t = s\}$ for the Hamiltonian flow. The resulting manifold is a $(2n+2d)$-dimensional manifold M_ϵ. The first return map to M_ε of the Hamiltonian flow is a C^{r-1}-differentiable map f_ϵ.

In the unperturbed case $\varepsilon = 0$, the manifold

$$\Lambda_0 := \{(p, q, I, \phi) \,|\, p = q = 0\} \subseteq M_0$$

is a normally hyperbolic invariant manifold for f_0, which is independent of the section $t = s$. The restriction of f_0 to Λ_0 is an integrable map: $f_0(0, 0, I, \phi) = (0, 0, I, \phi + \omega(I))$, and Λ_0 is foliated by invariant d-dimensional tori given by $\{I = ct\}$.

For the perturbed system, Λ_0 can be continued to a manifold Λ_ε diffeomorphic to Λ_0, that is, locally invariant for the perturbed return map f_ε for all ε sufficiently small. There exists a C^ℓ smooth parametrization $k_\varepsilon : \Lambda_0 \to \Lambda_\varepsilon$, with $k_0 = \mathrm{Id}$. The manifold Λ_ε is symplectic [23].

Condition (A3) above allows one to define a scattering map $\sigma_\varepsilon : \Omega^-(\Gamma_\varepsilon) \to \Omega^+(\Gamma_\varepsilon)$, with $\Omega^-(\Gamma_\varepsilon), \Omega^+(\Gamma_\varepsilon)$ open subsets of Λ_ε. As mentioned before, it is more convenient to express the scattering map σ_ε as a map on Λ_0, via $\tilde{\sigma}_\varepsilon = k_\varepsilon^{-1} \circ \sigma_\varepsilon \circ k_\varepsilon$. By hypothesis (A.3), we have $U^- \subseteq \mathrm{dom}(\tilde{\sigma}_\varepsilon) = k_\varepsilon^{-1}(\Omega^-(\Gamma_\varepsilon))$. In a similar fashion, we consider $\tilde{f}_\varepsilon = k_\varepsilon^{-1} \circ f_{\varepsilon|\Lambda_\varepsilon} \circ k_\varepsilon$ on Λ_0.

The papers [23, 25, 30] show that condition (A3) implies that the scattering map can be expressed as follows

$$\tilde{\sigma}_\varepsilon(I, \phi) = (I, \phi) + \varepsilon J \nabla \mathcal{L}^*(I, \phi - \omega(I)s) + O(\varepsilon^2).$$

Therefore Theorem 3.10 can be applied.

The function $\mathcal{L}^*$ involved in condition (A3) plays the role of the function S in Theorem 3.10. Condition (4.4) amounts to $J\nabla\mathcal{L}^*$ transverse to one level set of the variable I, and hence there exists a solution curve $t \in [0, 1] \mapsto \tilde{\gamma}(t)$ in Λ_0 for the Hamiltonian flow generated by $\mathcal{L}^*$ on Λ_0 such that $\|I(\tilde{\gamma}(1)) - I(\tilde{\gamma}(0)))\| = \rho_1 > 0$ for some $\rho_1 > 0$.

Choose ε_0 such that $\rho := \rho_1 - 2\varepsilon_0(1 + K) > 0$, where K is the constant of Theorem 3.10 and fix $0 < |\varepsilon| < \varepsilon_0$. Let $\gamma_\varepsilon = k_\varepsilon \circ \tilde{\gamma}$. Applying Theorem 3.10 for the scattering map σ_ε, and for $\delta := \varepsilon$, we obtain an orbit $z_{i+1} = f_\varepsilon^{k_i}(z_i)$, for some $k_i > 0$, such that $d(z_i, \gamma_\varepsilon(t_i)) < (1 + K)\varepsilon$, $i = 0, \ldots, n$, where $0 = t_0 < t_1 < \ldots < t_n \leq 1$. Hence $\|I(z_n) - I(z_0)\| > \rho$. Thus, we have obtained a trajectory whose I-coordinate changes $O(1)$ with respect to the perturbation. □

Remark 4.2. Note that in the case when $d = 1$, a non-degeneracy condition that $I \mapsto \omega(I) = \partial h_0/\partial I$ is a diffeomorphism translates into a condition that $\tilde{f}_\varepsilon$ is a monotone twist map relative to the (I, ϕ) coordinates. In our case, we allow $\tilde{f}_\varepsilon$ to be a non-twist map, which happens, for instance if $h_0(I) = I^n$ with $n \geq 3$ odd. It is well known that non-twist maps arise in many concrete models, such as models of magnetic fields of toroidal plasma devices, such as tokamaks, that have reversed magnetic shear, and models of transport by traveling waves in shear flows with zonal flow. Unlike twist maps, non-twist maps have regions where the KAM theorem and the Aubry-Mather theory do not apply, e.g., see [13, 19] and the references listed therein.

Remark 4.3. We describe a heuristic argument on how to obtain diffusing orbits of optimal speed using the method in this paper, in the case when h_0 satisfies a non-degeneracy condition that $I \mapsto \omega(I) = \partial h_0/\partial I$ is a diffeomorphism on some domain in Λ_0. To simplify the exposition, let us assume that $d = 1$. It follows that the map f_0 is a monotone twist map on Λ_0. Assuming that $J\nabla\mathcal{L}^*$ is transverse to one level set of the variable I, there exists a $O(1) \times O(1)$ scattering strip $\mathcal{V} \subset \Lambda_0$, i.e., a continuous $O(1)$-family of scattering paths along which the action variable I changes $O(1)$. Moreover, we can choose $\mathcal{V}$ to be a closed topological rectangle in Λ_0. Choose a range $[I_1, I_2]$ of action values such that each scattering path in the strip $\mathcal{V}$ intersects transversally each action level set $\{I = I_0\}$ with $I_0 \in [I_1, I_2]$, and $\omega(I) \neq 0$ for $I \in [I_1, I_2]$. To simplify the exposition we assume $\omega(I) > 0$, for $I \in [I_1, I_2]$.

Now we consider the perturbed system, with $\varepsilon > 0$ sufficiently small. Starting with a point $x \in \mathcal{V}$ and following it by the inner dynamics until it returns to $y \in \mathcal{V}$ the first time, the points x and y will lie, in general, near different scattering paths. We want to apply the argument of Theorem 3.10, but this time we will choose to follow different

scattering paths rather than a single one. That is, after we follow one scattering path by applying the scattering map to a point on that path, we apply the inner dynamics to return to some other scattering path in the scattering strip, and apply the scattering map again following that new path. Therefore, the argument here consists on contruct a pseudo orbit and then apply the results of Theorem 3.1.

The argument of Theorem 3.1 requires to generate pseudo-orbits of the form $y_{i+1} = f_\varepsilon^{m_i} \circ \sigma \circ f_\varepsilon^{n_i}(y_i)$, with m_i, n_i larger than some N. As it noted in Remark 5.1 in Subsection 5.2, N depends on the angle of intersection between $W^u(\Lambda)$ with $W^s(\Lambda)$. For the model (4.1), this angle is $O(\varepsilon)$. To estimate N, one needs to apply a quantitative version of the Lambda Lemma, as in [28, 54], yielding $N = K_1 \ln \varepsilon^{-1} = O(\ln \varepsilon^{-1})$, for some $K_1 > 0$. Thus, to generate a pseudo-orbit of the form $y_{i+1} = f_\varepsilon^{m_i} \circ \sigma \circ f_\varepsilon^{n_i}(y_i)$, starting with a point $x \in \mathcal{V}$ we have to apply the inner dynamics until it returns to $y \in \mathcal{V}$ in a time $O(\ln \varepsilon^{-1})$.

To control the inner dynamics, we perform 1-step of averaging as in [14]. The frequency range of motions along the level sets of the averaged system on Λ_ε are $O(\varepsilon)$-close to the corresponding frequency range $\omega(I)$, $I \in [I_1, I_2]$, of the unperturbed system, so it is bounded away from 0 if ε is sufficiently small. The map f_ε is ε^2-close to the map $\bar{f}_\varepsilon$ corresponding to the averaged system on Λ_ε.

We are going to use the returns of $\bar{f}_\varepsilon$ to approximate the returns of f_ε, so we choose a scattering strip $\mathcal{V}_\varepsilon \subseteq \mathcal{V}$ such that the ε-neighborhood of $\mathcal{V}_\varepsilon$ in Λ_ε is contained in $\mathcal{V}$. We let $\bar{\mathcal{V}}_\varepsilon, \bar{\mathcal{V}}$ be the above scattering strips in the averaged coordinates. Almost every point in $\bar{\mathcal{V}}$ returns under $O(1)$-iterates of $\bar{f}_\varepsilon$ to a point in $\bar{\mathcal{V}}$. Moreover, almost every point in $\bar{\mathcal{V}}$ is mapped under the $O(1)$-iterates of $\bar{f}_\varepsilon$ to a point in $\bar{\mathcal{V}}_\varepsilon$. Thus, for almost every point in $\bar{\mathcal{V}}$ we can achieve repeated returns under $\bar{f}_\varepsilon$ to $\bar{\mathcal{V}}$, and arrange that it eventually lands in $\bar{\mathcal{V}}_\varepsilon$ after $O(\ln \varepsilon^{-1})$ iterates.

Following the inner dynamics for a $O(\ln \varepsilon^{-1})$-time, the distance between the orbits of f_ε and those of $\bar{f}_\varepsilon$ is of the order at most $O(\varepsilon^2 \ln \varepsilon^{-1}) \ll O(\varepsilon)$. There exists $\varepsilon_1 > 0$ and $K_2 > K_1$ (depending on the frequency range), such that almost every point in $\mathcal{V}$ returns under the iterates of f_ε to a point in $\mathcal{V}$ in a time between $K_1 \ln(\varepsilon^{-1})$ and $K_2 \ln(\varepsilon^{-1})$. During this time, the action variable changes by $O(\varepsilon^2 \ln \varepsilon^{-1}) \ll O(\varepsilon)$. Each application of a scattering map σ yields a change in the I-coordinate of order $O(\varepsilon)$. Hence, one step of $y_{i+1} = f_\varepsilon^{m_i} \circ \sigma \circ f_\varepsilon^{n_i}(y_i)$, with $K_1 \ln(\varepsilon^{-1}) < m_i, n_i < K_2 \ln(\varepsilon^{-1})$ yields a change in the I-coordinate of order $O(\varepsilon)$ in a time of order $O(\ln \varepsilon^{-1})$. Thus, in ε^{-1} steps we obtain a pseudo-orbit which changes the I-coordinate by $O(1)$ in a time of order $O(\varepsilon^{-1} \ln \varepsilon^{-1})$. Theorem 3.1 yields a nearby orbit for which the I-coordinate changes by $O(1)$ in a time $O(\varepsilon^{-1} \ln \varepsilon^{-1})$. This time has been conjectured as optimal in [45].

5. Proofs of the results in Section 3

5.1. **Two systems of coordinates in a neighborhood of a normally hyperbolic invariant manifold.** We will consider two systems of coordinates in a neighborhood of Λ: a linearized system of coordinates, as in [52], and an almost linearized system of coordinates, defined via the exponential mapping, as in [32]. We provide brief descriptions below. The two coordinate systems will be used to construct sequences of

windows (i.e., homeomorphic copies of multidimensional rectangles) that are correctly aligned under the dynamics. The construction of the sequences of windows, which is done in Subsection 5.2, involves two main mechanisms:

(i) Using the transversality of the intersection of the stable and unstable manifolds along the homoclinic channel Γ and the Lambda Lemma, construct windows around the unstable manifold that are correctly aligned with some other windows around the stable manifold, via some number of iterations of the map which is bounded uniformly with respect to the sequence of windows.

(ii) Construct windows around the normally hyperbolic invariant manifold Λ that are correctly aligned with some other windows around the unstable manifold, via an arbitrarily large number of iterations of the map.

(iii) Concatenate the two types of correctly aligned windows from above in infinite sequences of correctly aligned windows.

We now describe the linearized coordinate system in a neighborhood V_Λ of the normally hyperbolic invariant manifold Λ in M, following [52]. There exists an open neighborhood V_Λ of Λ in M, an open neighborhood U_Λ of the zero section of $(E^u \oplus E^s)_{|\Lambda}$ and a homeomorphism h_{lin} from U_Λ to V_Λ such that for every $(x^c, v^u, v^s) \in (E^u \oplus E^s)_{|\Lambda}$

$$(h_{lin}^{-1} \circ f \circ h_{lin})(x^c, v^u, v^s) = Tf(x^c, v^u, v^s) = (f_{|\Lambda}(x^c), Df_{x^c}(v^u, v^s)).$$

Via this coordinate system, each point $p \in V_\Lambda$ can be written uniquely as (x^c, v^u, v^s) for some $x^c \in \Lambda$, $v^u \in E^u$, $v^s \in E^s$, as $p = h_{lin}(x^c, v^u, v^s)$.

In the linearized coordinates, the map f is conjugate with the tangent mapping $Tf_{|E^u \oplus E^s}$ of f in a neighborhood of Λ. Hence, relative to these coordinates, iterating a window by the map f for an arbitrarily number of times is equivalent to iterating the window by the tangent mapping Tf. However, this coordinate system is only C^0, so one cannot control the transverse intersection of manifolds relative to this system. For this reason, the linearized coordinate system will be used only for the mechanism (ii) mentioned above.

We now describe an almost linearized coordinate system in a neighborhood V'_Λ of Λ, following [32]. To every point p in a the neighborhood V'_Λ we can assign a unique triplet $x^c \in \Lambda, v^u \in E^u_{x^c}, v^s \in E^s_{x^c}$, such that $p = \exp_{x^c}(v^u + v^s)$. We define a map h from a neighborhood U'_Λ of the zero section of $(E^u \oplus E^s)_\Lambda$ to the neighborhood V'_Λ of Λ in M by $h(x^c, v^s, v^u) = \exp_{x^c}(v^u + v^s)$. It follows from the implicit function theorem that h is a C^ℓ-diffeomorphism, provided that the neighborhoods U'_Λ and V'_Λ are sufficiently small.

Let $\tilde{f} = h^{-1} \circ f \circ h : U'_\Lambda \to U'_\Lambda$. Take $\delta > 0$ and consider neighborhoods U'_Λ and V'_Λ as above contained in a δ-neighborhood of Λ. Then, if δ is small enough, the corresponding map $\tilde{f}$ is δ^2-close to Tf, i.e.,

$$\tilde{f}(x^c, v^u, v^s) - Tf(x^c, v^u, v^s) = R(x^c, v^u, v^s),$$

with $\|R\|_{C^0}, \|DR\|_{C^0} < \delta^2$, for $(x^c, v^u, v^s) \in U_\Lambda \cap U'_\Lambda$.

That is, by restricting to a sufficiently small domain, the map f expressed in the coordinates given by h can be made as close as one wants to its linearization Tf.

The almost linearized coordinate system is C^0-close to the linearized coordinate system in a neighborhood of Λ. This coordinate system is at least C^1-smooth, so we

can use it to control the transverse intersections of manifolds relative to this system. When a window is constructed via the almost linearized coordinates, its image under f can be made arbitrarily close to the image of this window under the tangent mapping Tf, provided that the window size is chosen small enough. Hence, relative to these coordinates, the iteration of a window by the map f is C^0-close to the iteration of the window by the tangent mapping Tf, provided that the number of iterations is uniformly upper bounded independently of the choice of the window, and that the window size is sufficiently small. For this reason, the almost linearized coordinate system will be used only for the mechanism (i) mentioned above.

We can restrict the domains of h_{lin} and h above so that $V_\Lambda = V'_\Lambda$. Hence, on $U_\Lambda \cap U'_\Lambda$ we have that the coordinate system h is C^0-close to the linearized coordinate system h_{lin}.

5.2. **Proof of Theorem 3.1.** To prove the existence of a shadowing orbit we use the method of correctly aligned windows (see Appendix B).

First, for a given δ we will find an $N > 0$ as in the statement of Theorem 3.1. Second, we will choose and fix a pseudo-orbit $\{y_i\}_{i\geq 0}$, with $y_{i+1} = f^{m_i} \circ \sigma \circ f^{n_i}(y_i)$ and $n_i, m_i \geq N$. Third, around the points $\{y_i\}$ of the given pseudo-orbit we will construct a sequence of windows so that the successive windows in the sequence are correctly aligned with one another under the dynamics. The construction will be possible for N large enough uniformly in y_i. Finally, the existence of a true orbit within these windows will follow from the shadowing property of correctly aligned windows, Theorem B.3. We proceed in several steps.

We will construct some windows in the almost linearized coordinates $h : U_\Lambda \to V_\Lambda$ and some other windows in the linearized coordinates $h_{lin} : U'_\Lambda \to V_\Lambda$, described in Subsection 5.1. Moreover, we choose V_Λ so that it is contained in a δ-neighborhood of Λ.

By the normal hyperbolicity of Λ, there exist $0 < \lambda_- < \lambda_+ < \mu_+^{-1} < \mu_-^{-1} < 1$ such that for each pair of balls $B_{\rho^u}(v^u) \subseteq E^u_x$ and $B_{\rho^s}(v^s) \subseteq E^s_x$, with $x \in \Lambda$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} B_{\rho^u \mu_-}(Df_{|E^u}(v^u)) \subseteq Df_{|E^u}(B_{\rho^u}(v^u)) \subseteq B_{\rho^u \mu_+}(Df_{|E^u}(v^u)), \\ B_{\rho^s \lambda_-}(Df_{|E^s}(v^s)) \subseteq Df_{|E^s}(B_{\rho^s}(v^s)) \subseteq B_{\rho^s \lambda_+}(Df_{|E^s}(v^s)). \end{aligned} \tag{5.1}$$

We construct a quadruplet of 'prototype' windows $\hat{W}$, $\check{W}$, $\check{W}'$, $\hat{W}'$ such that each consecutive pair of windows in the quadruplet is correctly aligned under some appropriate power of f, as described below.

The windows will be of the form:

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{W} &= h(B_{\hat{\rho}^c}(\hat{x}^c) \times B_{\hat{\rho}^u}(\hat{v}^u) \times B_{\hat{\rho}^s}(\hat{v}^s)), \\ \check{W} &= h_{lin}(B_{\check{\rho}^c}(\check{x}^c) \times B_{\check{\rho}^u}(\check{v}^u) \times B_{\check{\rho}^s}(\check{v}^s)), \\ \check{W}' &= h_{lin}(B_{\check{\rho}'^c}(\check{x}'^c) \times B_{\check{\rho}^u}(\check{v}^u) \times B_{\check{\rho}^s}(\check{v}^s)), \\ \hat{W}' &= h(B_{\hat{\rho}'^c}(\hat{x}'^c) \times B_{\hat{\rho}^u}(\hat{v}^u) \times B_{\hat{\rho}^s}(\hat{v}^s)). \end{aligned}$$

The definition of these windows will provide the value of N stated in the theorem. We will later use these prototype windows to construct an infinite sequence of correctly

aligned windows about a pseudo-orbit generated by alternately applying the scattering map and sufficiently high iterates of the inner dynamics.

By the compactness of Λ, there exists $\delta_1 > 0$ such that the images, under both h and h_{lin}, of products of balls in U_Λ of the form

$$B_{\rho^c}(x^c) \times B_{\rho^u}(v^u) \times B_{\rho^s}(v^s),$$

with $0 < \rho^c, \rho^u, \rho^s < \delta_1$, $x^c \in \Lambda$, and $\|v^u\|, \|v^s\| < \delta_1$, are contained in V_Λ, and have diameter less than $\delta/2$, for all $x \in \Lambda$. We will impose additional conditions on ρ^c, ρ^u, ρ^s later on.

Consider the homoclinic channel Γ, and the corresponding scattering map $\sigma : \Omega^-(\Gamma) \to \Omega^+(\Gamma)$. Choose n, k large enough so that:

(i) $f^{-n}(\Gamma) \subseteq V_\Lambda$, and for each $p \in \Gamma$, the distance from $f^{-n}(p)$ to Λ is less than $\delta/2$;
(ii) $f^k(\Gamma) \subseteq V_\Lambda$, and for each $p \in \Gamma$, the distance from $f^k(p)$ to Λ is less than $\delta/2$.

Since Λ, Γ are compact sets, and f^{-n}, $n \geq 0$, is uniformly contracting along the unstable fibers, if property (i) is verified for some $n = N_*$ large enough, then it remains valid for all $n \geq N_*$. Also, since f^k, $k \geq 0$, is uniformly contracting along the stable fibers, if property (ii) is verified for some $k = K_*$ large enough, then it remains valid for all $k \geq K_*$.

Fix a point $q \in \Gamma$. Consider the fiber $W^s(y)$ passing through q. As Γ is an homoclinic channel, $W^s(y)$ is transverse to $W^u(\Lambda)$ at q. By the Lambda Lemma [38, 28, 54], there exists a family of n_s-dimensional compact disks $D^s_n(q)$, $n \geq 0$, with $D^s_n(q) \subset W^s(y)$ being a neighborhood of q in $W^s(y)$, such that $f^{-n}(D^s_n(q))$ approaches, in the C^1-topology as $n \to \infty$, to $W^s(\Lambda)$. More concretely, it approaches a disk of fixed radius contained in some stable fiber $W^s(x_n)$. Note that $f^{-n}(q) \in f^{-n}(D^s_n(q))$ and, expressing $f^{-n}(D^s_n(q))$ in the h coordinates, one has that $h(f^{-n}(D^s_n(q)))$ is $\mathcal{C}^1$ close to $\{v^u = v^u_*\}$, where $h(x^c_*, v^u_*, v^s_*) = f^{-n}(q)$.

To the point $f^{-n}(q) \in f^{-n}(\Gamma)$ we attach a $(n_c + n_u)$-dimensional disk of the form $h(B_{\rho^c}(x^c_*) \times B_{\rho^u}(v^u_*) \times \{v^s_*\})$.

We remark that $h(B_{\rho^c}(x^c_*) \times B_{\rho^u}(v^u_*) \times \{v^s_*\})$ does not need to be contained in $W^u(\Lambda)$, it is however an 'approximation' of some disk in $W^u(\Lambda)$. More precisely, as $q \in \Gamma$ and Γ is a homoclinic channel, for some sufficiently large n there exist $\rho^c > 0$ and $\rho^u > 0$ sufficiently small, such that $h(B_{\rho^c}(x^c_*) \times B_{\rho^u}(v^u_*) \times \{v^s_*\})$ is transverse to $W^s(f^{-n}(y))$. (Note that $B_{\rho^c}(x^c_*) \times B_{\rho^u}(v^u_*) \times \{v^s_*\}$ is transverse to $\{v^u = v^u_*\}$.)

Fix $n = N_*$. Since Γ is compact, we can find ρ^c, ρ^u such that the above property holds for all $q \in \Gamma$. From now on we fix $\rho^c, \rho^u > 0$ so that this property is satisfied for all $q \in \Gamma$.

Now consider the family of $(n_c + n_u)$-dimensional disks $f^{N_*} \circ h(B_{\rho^c}(x^c_*) \times B_{\rho^u}(v^u_*) \times \{v^s_*\})$. Each such a disk passes through the point $q \in \Gamma$ and is transverse to the fiber $W^s(y)$ through q. Applying the Lambda Lemma again, there exists a family of (n_c+n_u)-dimensional disks $D^{cu}_k(q)$, $k \geq 0$, each disk being a neighborhood of q in $f^{N_*} \circ h(B_{\rho^c}(x^c_*) \times B_{\rho^u}(v^u_*) \times \{v^s_*\})$, such that $f^k(D^{cu}_k(q)) \subset f^k \circ f^{N_*} \circ h\,(B_{\rho^c}(x^c_*) \times B_{\rho^u}(v^u_*) \times \{v^s_*\})$ approaches, in the C^1-topology, a disk of fixed radius contained in $W^u(\Lambda)$, as $k \to \infty$.

Now we impose additional conditions on k.

Consider the family of n_s-dimensional disks $h_{lin}\left(\{z^c\}\times\{w^u\}\times B_{\rho^s}(0)\right)$ with $z^c\in\Lambda$ and $w^u\in B_\rho(0)$ for some $\rho>0$ and $\rho^s>0$. We require that k is sufficiently large so that $f^k(D_k^{cu}(q))\subset f^{k+N_*}\circ h\left(B_{\rho^c}(x_*^c)\times B_{\rho^u}(v_*^u)\times\{v_*^s\}\right)$ is topologically transverse to each such $h_{lin}\left(\{z^c\}\times\{w^u\}\times B_{\rho^s}(0)\right)$. See [34] for a definition of topological transversality.

In fact, it is enough to fix ρ^s and $k=K_*$ such that, if $f^{K_*}(q)=h_{lin}(\bar{x}^c,0,\bar{v}^s)$, then $h_{lin}\left(\{\bar{x}^c\}\times\{0\}\times B_{\rho^s}(0)\right)$ has a $\mathcal{C}^1$ transverse intersection with $f^{K_*}(D_{K_*}^{cu}(q))$, and then the continuity of h_{lin} ensures the existence of $\rho>0$, $\bar{\rho}^c>0$ such that the required property of topological transversality is verified for any $z^c\in B_{\bar{\rho}^c}(\bar{x}^c)$.

Due to the compactness of Λ there exists K_* large enough but finite, $\rho>0$, $\rho^s>0$, $\bar{\rho}^c>0$, such that if this property is valid for $k=K_*$, it remains valid for all $k\geq K_*$.

This property implies that $\pi_{c,u}(h_{lin}^{-1}\circ f^{K_*}(D_{K_*}^{cu}(q))$, which is the projection of of $f^{K_*}(D_{K_*}^{cu}(q))$ onto the (c,u)-subspace of $(E^u\oplus E^s)_\Lambda$ of the h_{lin} coordinate system, contains a set of the form $A\times B_\rho(0)$ for some open set $A\subseteq\Lambda$. (Here the set A should be chosen so that $f^{K_*}(H^+)\supseteq A$, where H^+ is the codomain of the scattering map σ.) We choose and fix $k=K_*$ as above.

Remark 5.1. We remark that the size of the set $A\times B_\rho(0)$ depends on the angle of the intersection between $W^u(\Lambda)$ and $W^s(\Lambda)$ along Γ, even if the coordinate system h_{lin} can not detect this angle. When this angle of intersection is small, the angle between $f^{K_*+N_*}\circ h(B_{\rho^c}(x_*^c)\times B_{\rho^u}(v_*^u)\times\{v_*^s\})$ and $W^s(\Lambda)$ may also be small, hence the projection $\pi_{c,u}(h_{lin}^{-1}\circ f^{K_*}(D_{K_*}^{cu}(q))$ may be a set of small diameter; consequently the size of A in Λ and ρ might be small. However, the argument here is only qualitative, as we do not make estimates on the dependence of A and ρ on the angle of intersection of the stable and unstable manifold. Such estimates can nevertheless be made by using the coordinate system h, but this has other difficulties and this quantitative approach is beyond the purpose of this result. All we need at this point is that there exist A and $\rho>0$ with the aforementioned properties.

Now we proceed with the construction of the prototype windows.

Let $p\in\Gamma$ and consider the pair of points $f^{-N_*}(p)\in V_\Lambda$ and $f^{K_*}(p)\in V_\Lambda$.

We construct the window $\hat{W}$ about $f^{-N_*}(p)$. We describe this window in terms of the local coordinates given by h. Let the coordinates of $f^{-N_*}(p)$ be $(\hat{x}^c,\hat{v}^u,\hat{v}^s)$, that is $f^{-N_*}(p)=h(\hat{x}^c,\hat{v}^u,\hat{v}^s)$. By the conditions on N_*, we have that $\|\hat{v}^u\|,\|\hat{v}^s\|<\delta_1$. We define the window $\hat{W}$ and its exit and entry sets $\hat{W}^{\text{exit}}$, $\hat{W}^{\text{entry}}$, respectively:

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{W}_h=&B_{\hat{\rho}^c}(\hat{x}^c)\times B_{\hat{\rho}^u}(\hat{v}^u)\times B_{\hat{\rho}^s}(\hat{v}^s),\\ \hat{W}_h^{\text{exit}}=&\partial B_{\hat{\rho}^c}(\hat{x}^c)\times B_{\hat{\rho}^u}(\hat{v}^u)\times B_{\hat{\rho}^s}(\hat{v}^s)\\ &\cup B_{\hat{\rho}^c}(\hat{x}^c)\times\partial B_{\hat{\rho}^u}(\hat{v}^u)\times B_{\hat{\rho}^s}(\hat{v}^s),\\ \hat{W}_h^{\text{entry}}=&B_{\hat{\rho}^c}(\hat{x}^c)\times B_{\hat{\rho}^u}(\hat{v}^u)\times\partial B_{\hat{\rho}^s}(\hat{v}^s),\end{aligned}$$

with $\hat{\rho}^u=\rho^u$. We choose any $\hat{\rho}^c<\rho^c$, and $\hat{\rho}^s<\rho^s$, that we will fix later on. Notice that $\hat{\rho}^c$, $\hat{\rho}^s$, and $\hat{\rho}^u$ are all smaller than δ_1. The notation $\hat{W}_h$ means that the window $\hat{W}$ is described in the coordinate system given by h; this means that $\hat{W}=h(\hat{W}_h)$.

As we already mentioned before, we stress that $h(B_{\hat{\rho}^c}(\hat{x}^c)\times B_{\hat{\rho}^u}(\hat{v}^u)\times\{\hat{v}^s\})$ does not need to be contained in $W^u(\Lambda)$, it is however an 'approximation' of some disk in

$W^u(\Lambda)$, in the sense that $h(B_{\hat\rho^c}(\hat x^c)\times B_{\hat\rho^u}(\hat v^u)\times\{v^s\})$ is transverse to the stable fiber $W^s(y)$ passing through the point $f^{-N_*}(p)$, for some $y\in\Lambda$.

We take a forward iterate $f^{K_*+N_*}(\hat W)$ of $\hat W$; the point $f^{-N_*}(p)$ is mapped onto $f^{K_*}(p)$. The set $f^{K_*+N_*}(\hat W)$ is still a window, being a homeomorphic copy of $\hat W$ under $f^{K_*+N_*}$, with the exit and entry sets being defined via $f^{K_*+N_*}$. However, the connected component of $f^{K_*+N_*}(\hat W)\cap V_\Lambda$ containing $f^{K_*}(p)$ does not need to be of product type in the local coordinates h (or h_{lin}).

We define a new window $\check W\subseteq V_\Lambda$ about $f^{K_*}(p)$ such that $f^{K_*+N^*}(\hat W)$ is correctly aligned with $\check W$ under the identity map, or, equivalently, $\hat W$ is correctly aligned with $\check W$ under $f^{K_*+N_*}$. This new window is described in the linearized coordinates h_{lin}. This is how we do it.

We denote the h_{lin} coordinates of $f^{K_*}(p)$ by $(\check x^c,0,\check v^s)$, that is: $f^{K_*}(p)=h_{lin}(\check x^c,0,\check v^s)$. The image set $f^{K_*+N_*}\circ h\left(B_{\hat\rho^c}(\hat x^c)\times B_{\hat\rho^u}(\hat v^u)\times\{\hat v^s\}\right)$ is a (n_c+n_u)-dimensional disk through $f^{K_*}(p)$ close to $W^u(\Lambda)$. This disk is transverse to $W^s(h_{lin}(\check x^c,0,0))$, where $h_{lin}(\check x^c,0,0)=f^k(y)\in\Lambda$.

We define a new rectangle in the linearized coordinates h_{lin}, given by

$$B_{\check\rho^c}(\check x^c)\times B_{\check\rho^u}(0)\times\{0\}.$$

Recall that K_* was chosen large enough so that the projection of $f^{K_*+N_*}\circ h\left(B_{\hat\rho^c}(\hat x^c)\times B_{\hat\rho^u}(\hat v^u)\times\{\hat v^s\}\right)$ onto the (c,u) coordinates contains a set of the form $A\times B_\rho(0)$ for some open set $A\subseteq\Lambda$, i.e.,

$$\pi_{c,u}\left(h_{lin}^{-1}\circ f^{K_*+N_*}\circ h\left(B_{\hat\rho^c}(\hat x^c)\times B_{\hat\rho^u}(\hat v^u)\times\{v^s\}\right)\right)\supseteq A\times B_\rho(0).$$

Here $\pi_{c,u}$ denotes the projection onto the (c,u)-subspace of $(E^u\oplus E^s)_\Lambda$ of the h_{lin} coordinate system. Let us now choose $\hat\rho^s$ is sufficiently small so that there exist $\check\rho^c>0$, $\check\rho^u>0$ such that the projection

$$\pi_{c,u}\left(h_{lin}^{-1}\circ f^{K_*+N_*}\circ h\left(B_{\hat\rho^c}(\hat x^c)\times B_{\hat\rho^u}(\hat v^u)\times B_{\hat\rho^s}(\hat v^s)\right)\right)$$

contains a rectangle of the form $B_{\check\rho^c}(\check x^c)\times B_{\check\rho^u}(0)$ in its interior.

These conditions fix $\hat\rho^s$ and $\check\rho^u$.

Then we choose $\check\rho^s$ sufficiently large so that the projection

$$\pi_s\left(h_{lin}^{-1}\circ f^{K_*+N_*}\circ h\left(B_{\hat\rho^c}(\hat x^c)\times B_{\hat\rho^u}(\hat v^u)\times B_{\hat\rho^s}(\hat v^s)\right)\right)$$

is contained in the interior of $B_{\check\rho^s}(0)$.

These conditions fix $\check\rho^s$.

Here π_s denotes the projection onto the (s)-subspace of $(E^u\oplus E^s)_\Lambda$ of the h_{lin} coordinate system. Additionally, we require that $\check\rho^c,\check\rho^u,\check\rho^s<\delta_1$.

We define

$$\begin{aligned}
\check W_{h_{lin}} =& B_{\check\rho^c}(\check x^c)\times B_{\check\rho^u}(0)\times B_{\check\rho^s}(0),\\
\check W^{\text{exit}}_{h_{lin}} =& \partial B_{\check\rho^c}(\check x^c)\times B_{\check\rho^u}(0)\times B_{\check\rho^s}(0)\\
&\cup B_{\check\rho^c}(\check x^c)\times\partial B_{\check\rho^u}(0)\times B_{\check\rho^s}(0),\\
\check W^{\text{entry}}_{h_{lin}} =& B_{\check\rho^c}(\check x^c)\times B_{\check\rho^u}(0)\times\partial B_{\check\rho^s}(0).
\end{aligned}$$

The notation $\check{W}_{h_{lin}}$ means that the window $\check{W}$ is described in the coordinate system given by h_{lin}; thus, $\check{W} = h_{lin}(\check{W}_{h_{lin}})$. By the product property of correct alignment Lemma B.4, the choices that we made imply that $\hat{W}$ is correctly aligned with $\check{W}$ under $f^{K_*+N_*}$.

Now we will define a number R_* sufficiently large such that the following constructions can be made. For any given $r \geq R_*$ and any given $0 \leq i_* \leq r$, we will construct a new window $\check{W}'$, of the same type as $\check{W}$, such that $\check{W}$ is correctly aligned with $\check{W}'$ under f^{i_*}, and the diameter of $\check{W}'$ is less than $\delta/2$. Then we will construct another window $\hat{W}'$, of the same type as $\hat{W}$, such that $\check{W}'$ is correctly aligned with $\hat{W}'$ under f^{r-i_*}.

We define R_*. By (5.1) there exists R_* large enough so that, for all $r \geq R_*$, the projection $\pi_u(h^{-1} \circ f^r \circ h_{lin})(\{0\} \times B_{\tilde{\rho}^u}(0) \times \{0\})$ contains the rectangle $B_{\hat{\rho}^u}(\hat{v}^u)$, where $\hat{v}^u$, $\hat{\rho}^u$ are the same as in the construction of the window $\hat{W}$ constructed earlier, and the projection $\pi_s(h^{-1} \circ f^r \circ h_{lin})(\{0\} \times \{0\} \times B_{\tilde{\rho}^s}(0))$ is contained in the rectangle $B_{\hat{\rho}^s}(\hat{v}^s)$, where $\hat{v}^s$ and $\hat{\rho}^s$ are the same as in the construction of the window $\hat{W}$. Here π_s denotes the projection onto the (s)-subspace of $(E^u \oplus E^s)_\Lambda$ of the h_{lin} coordinate system.

Note that here we use both coordinate systems h and h_{lin} which are C^0-close to one another, as mentioned in Subsection 5.1. We choose and fix such an R_*.

Let us consider an iterate $f^i(\check{W})$ of the window $\check{W}$. Since the window $\check{W}$ is of product type in the linearized coordinates h_{lin}, and f is conjugate to its linearization via h_{lin}, $f^i(\check{W})$ remains of a product type for all $i \geq 0$ as long as $f^i(\check{W}) \subseteq V_\Lambda$. Even if $f^i(\check{W}) \not\subseteq V_\Lambda$ for some i, there is a connected component of $f^i(\check{W}) \cap V_\Lambda$ that contains a subset of product type.

Fix some $r \geq R_*$ and some $0 \leq i_* \leq r$. We define the window $\check{W}'$ via the h_{lin} coordinates by

$$\check{W}'_{h_{lin}} = B_{\check{\rho}'^c}(\check{x}'^c) \times B_{\tilde{\rho}^u}(0) \times B_{\tilde{\rho}^s}(0),$$

for some $\check{x}'^c, \check{\rho}'^c$ specified below. The unstable (stable) components of $\check{W}'$ are the same as those of $\check{W}$. The exit and entry directions are defined in the same way as for $\check{W}$. Since both $\check{W}$ and $\check{W}'$ are of product type in the linearized coordinates, and f is conjugate with its linearization via h_{lin}, the exponential contraction (expansion) of the stable (unstable) directions ensure the correct alignment of their stable (unstable) components under f^{i_*}. On the other hand, there are no conditions on the dynamics restricted to the normally hyperbolic invariant manifold, hence the diameter of the center component of $f^{i_*}(\check{W})$ can be large. We choose the center component of $\check{W}'$ so that it is contained in the interior of the image of the center component of $\check{W}$ under f^{i_*}, and, additionally, has diameter less than $\delta/2$. More precisely, we require that $\pi_c(h_{lin}^{-1} \circ f^{i_*} \circ h_{lin}(B_{\check{\rho}^c}(\check{x}^c) \times \{0\} \times \{0\}))$ contains $B_{\check{\rho}'^c}(\tilde{x}'^c)$ in its interior, and that $\check{\rho}'^c < \delta_1$. We note that the center component of $\check{W}'$ depends on i_*. At this point we have obtained that $\check{W}$ is correctly aligned with $\check{W}'$ under f^{i_*}, and $\operatorname{diam}(\check{W}') < \delta/2$.

Now we take the iterate $f^{r-i_*}(\check{W}')$ of $\check{W}'$. Again, since $\check{W}'$ written in the linearized coordinates h_{lin} is of a product type and f is conjugate with its linearization via the homeomorphism h_{lin}, $f^{r-i_*}(\check{W}')$ remains of a product type, as long as $f^{r-i_*}(\check{W}') \subseteq V_\Lambda$.

We construct a window $\hat{W}'$ such that $\check{W}'$ is correctly aligned with $\hat{W}'$ under f^{r-i_*}. The window $\hat{W}'$ is defined in the almost linearized coordinates h.

Then we define the window $\hat{W}'$ and its exit and entry sets $(\hat{W}')^{\text{exit}}$, $(\hat{W}')^{\text{entry}}$, respectively:

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{W}'_h =& B_{\hat{\rho}'^c}(\hat{x}') \times B_{\hat{\rho}^u}(\hat{v}^u) \times B_{\hat{\rho}^s}(\hat{v}^s),\\ (\hat{W}'_h)^{\text{exit}} =& \partial B_{\hat{\rho}'^c}(\hat{x}') \times B_{\hat{\rho}^u}(\hat{v}^u) \times B_{\hat{\rho}^s}(\hat{v}^s)\\ &\cup B_{\hat{\rho}'^c}(\hat{x}') \times \partial B_{\hat{\rho}^u}(\hat{v}^u) \times B_{\hat{\rho}^s}(\hat{v}^s),\\ (\hat{W}'_h)^{\text{entry}} =& B_{\hat{\rho}'^c}(\hat{x}') \times B_{\hat{\rho}^u}(\hat{v}^u) \times \partial B_{\hat{\rho}^s}(\hat{v}^s),\end{aligned}$$

The central component of $\hat{W}'$ depends on r. More precisely, we choose $\hat{x}'^c \in \Lambda$ and $\hat{\rho}'^c > 0$, depending on r, and with $\hat{\rho}'^c < \rho^c < \delta_1$, such that the projection of $(h^{-1} \circ f^{r-i_*} \circ h_{lin})(B_{\check{\rho}'^c}(\check{x}'^c) \times \{0\} \times \{0\}))$ onto the c-component contains $B_{\hat{\rho}'^c}(\hat{x}')$ in its interior.

The choices that we made for R_* and $\hat{W}'$ ensure that $\check{W}'$ is correctly aligned with $\hat{W}'$ under f^{r-i_*}.

Note that the last two steps of the construction ensures that the points in $\check{W}$ whose images under f^{i_*} are in $\check{W}' \cap f^{i_*}(\check{W})$, and whose subsequent images under f^{r-i_*} are in $f^{r-i_*}(\check{W}') \cap \hat{W}'$, always stay in V_λ; the construction of correctly aligned windows above does not make use of the points in $\check{W}$ which leave V_Λ under some iterate of f.

To summarize, for any given $r \geq R_*$ and $0 \leq i_* \leq r$ we have constructed $\hat{W}, \check{W}, \check{W}', \hat{W}'$ such that $\hat{W}$ is correctly aligned with $\check{W}$ under $f^{K_*+N_*}$, $\check{W}$ is correctly aligned with $\check{W}'$ under f^{i_*}, and $\check{W}'$ is correctly aligned with $\hat{W}'$ under f^{r-i*}. The windows $\hat{W}, \check{W}, \check{W}'$ do not depend on the choices of N_* and K_*. The hyperbolic components of $\hat{W}'$ do not depend on the choice of r, i_*, but its central component does. A schematic representation of the construction of the quadruplet of windows $\hat{W}, \check{W}, \check{W}', \hat{W}'$ constructed so far is shown in Figure 1.

Define $N = N_* + K_* + R_*$. We claim that this value of N satisfies the requirements of the statement of Theorem 3.1. That is, for every pseudo-orbit of the form $y_{i+1} = f^{m_i} \circ \sigma \circ f^{n_i}(y_i)$ with $m_i, n_i \geq N$, there exists a true orbit z_i with $z_{i+1} = f^{m_i+n_i}(z_i)$ and $d(z_i, y_i) < \delta$ for all $i \geq 0$.

Henceforth we choose and fix a pseudo-orbit $\{y_i\}_{i\geq 0}$ as above and we proceed to show the existence of a shadowing orbit $\{z_i\}_{i\geq 0}$. We will construct inductively a sequence of correctly aligned windows about the points of the pseudo-orbit $\{y_i\}_{i\geq 0}$; in this construction we will use the windows $\hat{W}, \check{W}, \check{W}', \hat{W}'$ as prototypes.

We start with y_0 and $y_1 = f^{m_0} \circ \sigma \circ f^{n_0}(y_0)$. Note that by assuming the existence of the points y_0, y_1 as above, we must have $f^{n_0}(y_0)$ is in the domain $\Omega^-(\Gamma)$ of σ, and $\sigma \circ f^{n_0}(y_0)$ is in the range $\Omega^+(\Gamma)$ of σ.

Thus $W^u(f^{n_0}(y_0)) \cap W^s(\sigma(f^{n_0}(y_0)) \cap \Gamma = \{p_0\}$ for some uniquely defined point $p_0 \in \Gamma$.

First, we construct a window $\hat{W}_0 \subseteq V_\Lambda$ about $f^{-N_*}(p_0) \in W^u(f^{n_0-N_*}(y_0)) \cap V_\Lambda$. In terms of the local coordinates given by h, we let $\hat{W}_0$ to be a window of the type $\hat{W}$, given by

$$\hat{W}_0 = h(B_{\hat{\rho}_0^c}(\hat{x}_0) \times B_{\hat{\rho}_0^u}(\hat{v}_0^u) \times B_{\hat{\rho}_0^s}(\hat{v}_0^s))$$



FIGURE 1. Construction of windows.

with the exit and entry sets defined as for $\hat{W}$, and with the following specifications: $f^{n_0-N_*}(y_0) = h(\hat{x}_0^c, 0, 0)$, and $f^{-N_*}(p_0) = h(\hat{x}_0^c, \hat{v}_0^u, \hat{v}_0^s)$, and $\hat{\rho}_0^u := \hat{\rho}_u$, $\hat{\rho}_0^s := \hat{\rho}^s$, and we choose any $\hat{\rho}_0^c < \rho^c$ that will be fixed by the condition specified in the second step below.

In fact, as one can see by its definition, this window $\hat{W}_0$ is not close to the first point of the pseudo orbit y_0 but to its image $f^{n_0-N_*}(y_0)$. Therefore, now we construct 'a posteriori' a previous window $\check{W}_{-1}$ close to y_0 and correctly aligned with $\hat{W}_0$ under the map $f^{n_0-N^*}$.

Therefore, we take the iterate $f^{-n_0+N_*}(\hat{W}_0)$ of $\hat{W}_0$. The point $f^{-N_*}(p_0)$ is mapped by $f^{-n_0+N_*}$ into the point $f^{-n_0}(p_0) \in W^u(y_0)$. We construct the window $\check{W}_{-1} \subseteq V_\Lambda$ such that $\check{W}_{-1}$ is correctly aligned with $f^{-n_0+N_*}(\hat{W}_0)$ under the identity map, or, equivalently, $\check{W}_{-1}$ is correctly aligned with $\hat{W}_0$ under $f^{n_0-N_*}$. Consider the set $\pi_c(h_{lin}^{-1}(f^{-n_0+N_*}(\hat{W}_0)))$. Consider $y_0 = h_{lin}(x_0^c, 0, 0)$ and choose $\check{\rho}_0^c$ such that the ball $B_{\check{\rho}_0^c}(x_0^c)$ in Λ is contained in the interior the set $\pi_c(h_{lin}^{-1}(f^{-n_0+N_*}(\hat{W}_0)))$. On $\hat{\rho}_0^c$ we impose that it is small enough so that there exists $\check{\rho}_0^c$ as above with $\check{\rho}_0^c < \rho^c$. The window $\check{W}_{-1}$ is constructed in terms of the local coordinates given by h_{lin} as a window of the type $\check{W}$, given by

$$\check{W}_{-1} = h_{lin}(B_{\check{\rho}_0^c}(x_0^c) \times B_{\check{\rho}_0^u}(0) \times B_{\check{\rho}_0^s}(0)),$$

with the exit and entry sets defined as for $\check{W}$, and with the following specifications: x_0^c, $\check{\rho}_0^c$ is as above, $\check{\rho}_0^u = \check{\rho}^u$, and $\check{\rho}_0^s = \check{\rho}^s$. By these choices we ensure that $\check{W}_0$ is

correctly aligned with with $\hat{W}_{-1}$ under $f^{n_0-N_*}$. (Note that this is the same type of correct alignment as between $\check{W}$ and $\hat{W}'$ under f^r, since $n_0 - N_* \geq N - N_* \geq R_*$.)

Now we take the iterate $f^{N_*+K^*}(\hat{W}_0)$ of $\hat{W}_0$. The point $f^{-N_*}(p_0)$ is mapped by $f^{N^*+K_*}$ into $f^{K_*}(p_0) \in W^s(f^{K_*}(\sigma(f^{n_0}(y_0))) \cap V_\Lambda$. We define a window $\check{W}_0 \subseteq V_\Lambda$ about $f^{K_*}(p_0)$. We let $\check{W}_0$ be a window of the type $\check{W}$ given by

$$\check{W}_0 = h_{lin}(B_{\check{\rho}_0^c}(\check{x}_0^c) \times B_{\check{\rho}_0^u}(0) \times B_{\check{\rho}_0^s}(0)),$$

with the exit and entry sets defined as for $\check{W}$, and with the following specification: $\sigma(f^{n_0}(y_0)) = h_{lin}(\check{x}_0^c, 0, 0)$, $\check{\rho}_0^u := \check{\rho}^u$, and $\check{\rho}_0^s := \check{\rho}^s$.

Since $\hat{W}$ is correctly aligned with $\check{W}$ under $f^{K_*+N_*}$, we obtain that have that $\hat{W}_0$ is correctly aligned with $\check{W}_0$ under $f^{K_*+N_*}$.

Now we continue the construction of windows relative to the point y_1 of the pseudo-orbit. We have that $y_1 = f^{m_0} \circ \sigma \circ f^{n_0}(y_0)$ is in $f^{-n_1}(\Omega^-(\Gamma))$, and so $f^{n_1}(y_1) \in \Omega^-(\Gamma)$ and $\sigma(f^{n_1}(y_1)) \in \Omega^+(\Gamma)$. There exists a uniquely defined point $p_1 \in \Gamma$ such that $W^u(f^{n_1}(y_1)) \cap W^s(\sigma(f^{n_1}(y_1))) \cap \Gamma = \{p_1\}$. By the choice of N_*, we have that $f^{-N_*}(p_1) \in V_\Lambda$, and the distance from $f^{-N_*}(p_1)$ to Λ along the unstable fibers, measured in the coordinate system h, is less than $\delta/2$.

Choose $r_0 = m_0+n_1-K_*-N_*$ and choose $i_0 = m_0-K_*$. Since $m_0, n_1 \geq N_*+K_*+R_*$, we have $r_0 \geq R_*$. We construct the window $\check{W}_0'$ about y_1 such that $\check{W}_0$ is correctly aligned with $\check{W}_0'$ under f^{i_0}, and we construct the window $\hat{W}_1$ about $f^{-N_*}(p_1)$ such that $\check{W}_0'$ is correctly aligned with $\hat{W}_1$ under $f^{r_0-i_0}$, as follows. We describe $\check{W}_0'$ in the local coordinates h_{lin} to be a window of the type $\check{W}'$, given by

$$\check{W}_0' = h_{lin}(B_{\check{\rho}_0'^c}(\check{x}_0'^c) \times B_{\check{\rho}_0^u}(0) \times B_{\check{\rho}_0^s}(0)),$$

with the specification that $h_{lin}(\check{x}_0'^c, 0, 0) = y_1$, the exit and entry directions defined as for $\check{W}'$, and $\check{\rho}_0'^c$ is so that $(h_{lin}^{-1} \circ f^{i_0} \circ h_{lin})(B_{\check{\rho}_0^c}(x_0^c) \times \{0\} \times \{0\}))$ onto the c-component contains $B_{\check{\rho}_0'^c}(x_0'^c)$.

We describe $\hat{W}_1$ in the local coordinates h by letting $\hat{W}_1$ to be a window of the type $\hat{W}'$, given by given by

$$\hat{W}_1 = h(B_{\hat{\rho}_1^c}(\hat{x}_1^c) \times B_{\hat{\rho}_1^u}(\hat{v}_1^u) \times B_{\hat{\rho}_1^s}(\hat{v}_1^s)),$$

with the exit and entry sets defined as for $\hat{W}'$, and with the following specifications: $f^{-N_*}(p_1) = h(\hat{x}_1^c, \hat{v}_1^u, \hat{v}_1^s)$, and $f^{-N_*+n_1}(y_0) = h(\hat{x}_1^c, 0, 0)$, $\hat{\rho}_1^u = \hat{\rho}^u$, $\hat{\rho}_1^s = \hat{\rho}^s$, and $\hat{\rho}_1^c$ is chosen so that the projection $(h^{-1} \circ f^{r_0-i_0} \circ h_{lin})(B_{\check{\rho}_0'^c}(x_0'^c) \times \{0\} \times \{0\}))$ onto the c-component contains $B_{\hat{\rho}_1^c}(\hat{x}_1)$.

From this point, the construction is repeated inductively in a similar fashion. The result is a sequence of windows of the type

$$\check{W}_{-1}, \hat{W}_0, \check{W}_0, \check{W}_0', \hat{W}_1, \ldots, \hat{W}_k, \check{W}_k, \check{W}_k', \hat{W}_{k+1}, \ldots$$

for all $k \geq 0$ we have

- $\hat{W}_k$ is correctly aligned with $\check{W}_k$ under $f^{K_*+N_*}$,
- $\check{W}_k$ is correctly aligned with $\check{W}_k'$ under f^{i_k}, with $i_k = m_{k+1} - K_*$, and
- $\check{W}_k'$ is correctly aligned with $\hat{W}_{k+1}$ under $f^{r_k-i_k}$, with $r_k = n_k+m_{k+1}-N_*-K_*$.

All windows have diameter less than $\delta/2$. The shadowing property of correctly aligned windows – Theorem B.3 – implies that there exists a point $z_0 \in \check{W}_{-1}$ whose forward orbit visits all windows in the prescribed order.

If we define $z_1 = f^{n_0+m_0}(z_0)$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} z_0, y_0 &\in \check{W}_{-1}, \\ f^{n_0-N^*}(z_0), f^{n_0-N^*}(y_0) &\in \hat{W}_0, \\ f^{n_0+K^*}(z_0), f^{n_0+K^*}(y_0) &\in \check{W}_0, \\ f^{n_0+m_0}(z_0), f^{n_0} \circ \sigma \circ f^{m_0}(y_0) &\in \check{W}'_0, \\ f^{m_1-N^*}(z_1), f^{m_1-N^*}(y_1) &\in \hat{W}_1. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, taking $i_0 = m_0 - K_* \leq m_0 + n_1 - N^* - K_*$, we obtain

$$z_1, y_1 \in \check{W}'_0.$$

Analogously, defining $z_{k+1} = f^{n_k+m_k}(z_k)$, one has, for every $k \geq 1$:

$$\begin{aligned} z_k, y_k &\in \check{W}_{k-1}, \\ f^{n_k-N^*}(z_k), f^{n_k-N^*}(y_k) &\in \hat{W}_k, \\ f^{n_k+K^*}(z_k), f^{n_k+K^*}(y_k) &\in \check{W}_k, \\ f^{m_k+n_k}(z_k), y_{k+1} = f^{m_k} \circ \sigma \circ f^{n_k}(y_k) &\in \check{W}'_k, \\ f^{n_{k+1}-N^*}(z_{k+1}), f^{n_{k+1}-N^*}(y_{k+1}) &\in \hat{W}_{k+1} \end{aligned}$$

Taking $i_k = m_k - K^* \leq m_k + n_{k+1} - N^* - K^*$ we obtain

$$z_{k+1}, y_{k+1} \in \check{W}'_k.$$

We have obtained that for any iterate k one has $z_k, y_k \in \check{W}'_k$ and therefore, as $\operatorname{diam}(\hat{W}'_k) < \delta/2$ one has $|z_k - y_k| \leq \delta$. □

Remark 5.2. In the proof of Theorem 3.1, we have construct windows $\check{W}_k, \check{W}'_k, \hat{W}_{k+1}$ in V_Λ such that $\check{W}_k, \check{W}'_k$ are correctly aligned under some f^{i_k}, and $\check{W}'_k, \hat{W}_{k+1}$ are correctly aligned under some $f^{r_k-i_k}$. By the construction, $f^t(\check{W}_k) \subseteq V_\Lambda$ for all $0 \leq t \leq i_k$, and $f^s(\check{W}'_k) \subseteq V_\Lambda$ for all $0 \leq s \leq r_k - i_k$, so the corresponding segments of the shadowing orbit stays in V_Λ for this entire time. Thus, the construction in the proof of the lemma enables one to find shadowing orbits that stay close to Λ for a specified length of time, between two consecutive homoclinic excursions.

Remark 5.3. Theorem 3.1 provides a true forward orbit that shadows a given forward pseudo-orbit. The current proof does not allow to immediately extend this result for bi-infinite orbits. We remark that there is no assumption on the inner dynamics given by $f_{|\Lambda}$. The alignment in the c-coordinate component of the dynamics was achieved by defining, at each step of the construction, the c-component of $\hat{W}_{i+1}$ as a ball inside c-component of $\check{W}'_i$. Thus, the consecutive balls in the center direction can get smaller and smaller in size as i increases. However, if we try to continue the procedure in backwards time, the c-components of the windows $\check{W}'_j$, $j \leq 0$, may get bigger and bigger in size. Thus, we may loose control on the shadowing trajectory, that is, the

resulting shadowing orbit does not necessarily stay δ-close to the prescribed pseudo-orbit.

Remark 5.4. Similar statements to Theorem 3.1 appear in [17, 18]. The main difference is that the statements in these papers assume the existence of some lower dimensional windows in Λ such that each consecutive pair of windows are correctly aligned, alternatively, under the scattering map, and under some powers of the inner map. The outcomes are true orbits shadowing these lower dimensional windows. The statement in this paper starts with a pseudo-orbit in Λ generated by the composition of the scattering map with some powers of the inner map, and yields true orbits shadowing these pseudo-orbits.

Remark 5.5. As it was noted before, applying the scattering map $\sigma(x^-) = x^+$ does not define a trajectory of the system from x^- to x^+ but a heteroclinic connection. Let x be the point uniquely defined by $W^u(x^-) \cap W^s(x^+) \cap \Gamma = \{x\}$. Theorem 3.1 associates to $\sigma(x^-) = x^+$ a trajectory segment $f^i(x)$, $i \in \{-n, \dots, m\}$, for some m, n, which is backwards asymptotic to the negative orbit of x^- and is forward asymptotic to the positive orbit of x^+. For m, n fixed, we can define the map $f^{-n}(x) \mapsto f^m(x)$ which defines a true orbit of the system, and is closely related to the scattering map; this is referred to as a transition map in [18]. Thus, Theorem 3.1 can be reformulated that every pseudo-orbit obtained by successively combining the inner map and the scattering map can be approximated by a true orbit obtained successively applying transition maps.

5.3. **Proof of Theorem 3.4.** Denote by μ the measure referred in the statement of the theorem, which is absolutely continuous with respect to Lebesgue measure on Λ. Then f preserves μ, and σ takes zero measure sets into zero measure sets (Luzin N property).

Choose a small open neighborhood B_0 of x_0 in Λ, with $B_0 \subseteq \mathcal{U}$ such that $B_i := \sigma^i(B_0) \subseteq \mathcal{U}$, and $\operatorname{diam}(B_i) \leq \delta/2$, for all $i = 1, \dots, n$.

Let N be a fixed integer as in Theorem 3.1. Consider the map $g = f^{2N}$, which also preserves the measure μ. Since μ-a.e. point in $\mathcal{U}$ is recurrent, then for each $i \in \{0, \dots, n\}$, there exists a full measure set $R_i \subseteq B_i$ of points $y \in R_i$ such that $g^t(y) \in B_i$ for some $t \geq 1$. For each $y \in R_i$ we denote by $t_{min}(y)$ the smallest positive integer $t \geq 1$ with $g^t(y) \in B_i$. The collection of the return points $R_i' = \{g^{t_{min}(y)}(y) \,|\, y \in R_i\}$ also has full measure in B_i, as we show below.

Indeed, if we let $\Theta = \{t \geq 1 \,|\, \exists y \in R_0 \text{ s.t. } t_{min}(y) = t\}$ be the set of the return times to B_0, and, for each $t \in \Theta$, we let $C_t = \{y \in R_0 \,|\, t_{min}(y) = t\}$ be the set of points with a prescribed return time $t \in \Theta$, then $R_i = \bigcup_{t\in\Theta} C_t$, with the sets C_t mutually disjoint. Then the sets $g^t(C_t)$, $t \in \Theta$, are also mutually disjoint subsets in B_0; otherwise we have $g^t(y) = g^{t'}(y')$ for some $0 < t < t'$ and $y \in C_t$, $y' \in C_{t'}$, so $y = g^{t'-t}(y') \in B_0$ with $1 \leq t' - t \leq t'$ which is a contradiction. Now, since the $g^t(C_t)$'s are mutually disjoint and g is area preserving, $\mu(C_t) = \mu(g^t(C_t))$ for $t \in \Theta$, hence the set $R_i' = \bigcup_{t\in\Theta} g^t(C_t)$ is of full measure set in B_0, as claimed.

Thus, every point in $R_i \subseteq B_i$ will return to a point in $R_i' \subseteq B_i$ after some positive number of iterates of g. In terms of f, every point in $R_i \subseteq B_i$ will return to a point in $R_i' \subseteq B_i$ after at least $2N$ iterates.

Now we consider the open set $B_{i+1} = \sigma(B_i) \subseteq \mathcal{U}$ which is a neighborhood of $x_{i+1} = \sigma(x_i)$ in Λ. Since σ is absolutely continuos and the set R_i' has full measure in B_i then the set $\sigma(R_i')$ is a full measure set in B_{i+1}.

Starting from B_0, we can construct a tower of full measure subsets of B_0 that are carried onto full measure subsets of B_i, $i = 1, \dots, n$, via successive applications of powers of g and of σ. More precisely, we define inductively the following sets

$$\Sigma_0 = R_0,$$

$$\Sigma_1 = \left\{ y \in B_0 \,|\, \exists t_0, t_1 \geq 1,\, g^{t_0}(y) \in R_0',\, \sigma \circ g^{t_0}(y) \in R_1,\, g^{t_1} \circ \sigma \circ g^{t_0}(y) \in R_1' \right\},$$

$$\Sigma_2 = \left\{ y \in B_0 \,|\, \exists t_0, t_1, t_2 \geq 1,\, g^{t_0}(y) \in R_0',\, \sigma \circ g^{t_0}(y) \in R_1,\, g^{t_1} \circ \sigma \circ g^{t_0}(y) \in R_1', \right.$$
$$\left. \sigma \circ g^{t_1} \circ \sigma \circ g^{t_0}(y) \in R_2,\, g^{t_2} \circ \sigma \circ g^{t_1} \circ \sigma \circ g^{t_0}(y) \in R_2' \right\},$$

$\dots$

We clearly have that $\Sigma_0 \supseteq \Sigma_1 \supseteq \cdots \supseteq \Sigma_n$, and each set Σ_i, $i = 0, \dots, n$ has full measure in B_0. In particular, the points of $y \in \Sigma_n$ have the property that there exist $t_0, t_1, \dots, t_n \geq 1$ such that $g^{t_n} \circ \sigma \circ \dots \sigma \circ g^{t_0}(y) \in B_n$. In terms of f, for every $y \in \Sigma_n$, there exists $k_0, k_1, \dots, k_n \geq 2N$ such that

$$(f^{k_n} \circ \sigma \circ \cdots \circ f^{k_0} \circ \sigma \circ f^{k_0})(y) \in B_n, \tag{5.2}$$

and the set of all points in B_n obtained as above has full measure in B_n.

Now we generate a pseudo-orbit of the form $y_{i+1} = f^{m_i} \circ \sigma \circ f^{n_i}(y_i)$ as in the statement in Theorem 3.1. Start with any point $y_0 \in \Sigma_n \subseteq B_0$. Let $n_0 = t_0$, and note that since $t_0 \geq 2N$ we have $n_0 \geq 2N$. For each $1 \leq i \leq n-1$ choose $m_{i-1}, n_i \geq N$ such that $m_{i-1} + n_i = t_i$. Since $t_i \geq 2N$ is it possible to make this choice of m_{i-1}, n_i. Finally, choose $m_{n-1} = t_n$. Applying Theorem 3.1 for the pseudo-orbit $\{y_i\}$ and for $\delta/2$, yields an orbit $\{z_i\}$ with $z_{i+1} = f^{k_i}(z_i)$, where $k_i = m_{i-1} + n_i$, such that $d(y_i, z_i) < \delta/2$. Since $d(x_i, y_i) < \delta/2$, we conclude $d(x_i, z_i) < \delta$ for all i. □

5.4. **Proof of Theorem 3.10.** We notice that (3.1) is reminiscent of the forward Euler method for ordinary differential equations.

As $J\nabla S(\tilde{x}_0) \neq 0$ at some point $\tilde{x}_0 \in \Lambda$, we know that the solution

$$\frac{d}{dt}\mathcal{S}(t) = J\nabla S \circ \mathcal{S}(t) \tag{5.3}$$

with $\mathcal{S}(0) = \tilde{x}_0$ is not a constant solution. Let's denote $\mathcal{S}(t) = \phi(t, \tilde{x}_0)$ where $\phi(t, x)$ is the flow of (5.3). Consider $n = \mathrm{E}(\frac{1}{\mu})$, where $\mu = \mu(\varepsilon)$ is the parameter which appears in (3.1), and define two sequences:

$$\tilde{y}_i = \mathcal{S}(t_i) = \phi(\Delta t, \tilde{y}_{i-1}), \quad \tilde{x}_i = \tilde{\sigma}_\varepsilon(\tilde{x}_{i-1}), \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, n \quad \tilde{x}_0 = \tilde{y}_0,$$

where $t_i = i\mu$ and $\Delta t = \mu$. We will use two facts. On one hand, by (3.1), it is clear that there exists a constant $K_1 > 0$ which is independent of μ, ε such that

$$\|\tilde{\sigma}_\varepsilon(\tilde{x}) - \tilde{\sigma}_\varepsilon(\tilde{x}')\| \leq (1 + K_1\mu)\|\tilde{x} - \tilde{x}'\|, \quad \text{for } \tilde{x}, \tilde{x}' \in \mathcal{U}_{\tilde{\mathcal{S}}}. \tag{5.4}$$

On the other hand, also by (3.1), there exists a constant $K_2 > 0$ which is independent of μ, ε such that

$$\|\tilde{\sigma}_\varepsilon(\tilde{x}) - \phi(\Delta t, \tilde{x})\| \leq K_2\mu^2, \quad \text{for} \quad \tilde{x} \in \mathcal{U}_{\tilde{\mathcal{S}}}. \tag{5.5}$$



FIGURE 2. A scattering path and a nearby orbit of the scattering map.

Now one easily obtains that, by (5.5), $\|\tilde{x}_1 - \tilde{y}_1\| = \|\tilde{\sigma}_\varepsilon(\tilde{x}_0) - \phi(\mu, \tilde{x}_0)\| \leq K_2\mu^2$ and, consequently, $\tilde{x}_1 \in \mathcal{U}_{\tilde{\mathcal{S}}}$. Now, using again (5.4) and (5.5)

$$\begin{aligned} \|\tilde{x}_2 - \tilde{y}_2\| &= \|\tilde{\sigma}_\varepsilon(\tilde{x}_1) - \phi(\mu, \tilde{y}_1)\| \leq |\tilde{\sigma}_\varepsilon(\tilde{x}_1) - \tilde{\sigma}_\varepsilon(\tilde{y}_1)\| + \|\tilde{\sigma}_\varepsilon(\tilde{y}_1) - \phi(\mu, \tilde{y}_1)\| \\ &\leq (1 + K_1\mu)\|\tilde{x}_1 - \tilde{y}_1\| + K_2\mu^2 \leq K_2\mu^2(c+1) \end{aligned}$$

where we denote by $c = 1 + K_1\mu > 1$.

Consequently, $\tilde{x}_1 \in \mathcal{U}_{\tilde{\mathcal{S}}}$. Now we proceed by induction. We assume that, for some $0 \leq i \leq n$, one has that

$$\|\tilde{x}_i - \tilde{y}_i\| \leq K_2\mu^2(1 + c + c^2 + \cdots + c^{i-1})$$

And, using again (5.4) and (5.5) we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} \|\tilde{x}_{i+1} - \tilde{y}_{i+1}\| &= \|\tilde{\sigma}_\varepsilon(\tilde{x}_i) - \phi(\mu, \tilde{y}_i)\| \leq \|\tilde{\sigma}_\varepsilon(\tilde{x}_i) - \tilde{\sigma}_\varepsilon(\tilde{y}_i)\| + \|\tilde{\sigma}_\varepsilon(\tilde{y}_i) - \phi(\mu, \tilde{y}_i)\| \\ &\leq (1 + K_1\mu)\|\tilde{x}_i - \tilde{y}_i\| + K_2\mu^2 \leq K_2\mu^2(1 + c + c^2 + \cdots + c^i) \end{aligned}$$

Therefore we have that, using that $c = 1 + K_1\mu$, and that $n = \mathrm{E}(\frac{1}{\mu})$, for $i = 0, 1, \ldots, n$:

$$\|\tilde{x}_i - \tilde{y}_i\| \leq K_2\mu^2\frac{c^i - 1}{c - 1} \leq \frac{K_2}{K_1}\mu(1 + K_1\mu)^i \leq \frac{K_2}{K_1}\mu(1 + K_1\mu)^{\frac{1}{\mu}} \leq \frac{K_2}{K_1}\mu\mathrm{e}^{K_1}.$$

As, $\mu = \mu(\varepsilon) = o(\varepsilon)$, there exists ε_1, such that if $0 \leq \varepsilon \leq \varepsilon_1$, we obtain that the sequence $\tilde{x}_i$ of the scattering map is also in $\mathcal{U}_{\tilde{\mathcal{S}}}$ and is μ-close to the orbit $\mathcal{S}$:

$$\tilde{x}_{i+1} = \tilde{\sigma}_\varepsilon(\tilde{x}_i) \in \mathcal{U}_{\tilde{\mathcal{S}}} \subset \Lambda, \quad d(\tilde{\mathcal{S}}(t_i), \tilde{x}_i) < K\mu(\varepsilon), \quad i = 0, \ldots, n,$$

where $K = \frac{K_2}{K_1}\mathrm{e}^{K_1}$, and $n = \mathrm{E}(\frac{1}{\mu})$ depends on ε, for the increasing sequence of parameters $t_i = i\mu \in [0, 1]$, $i = 0, \ldots, n$. The points $\tilde{x}_i$ represent an orbit of $\tilde{\sigma}_\varepsilon$ in Λ, therefore the points $x_i = k_\varepsilon(\tilde{x}_i)$, represent an orbit of σ_ε in Λ_ε, verifying $d(x_i, \mathcal{S}_\varepsilon(t_i)) < \bar{K}\mu(\varepsilon)$, where $\mathcal{S}_\varepsilon = k_\varepsilon \circ \mathcal{S}$. This orbit $\tilde{x}_i$ lies inside the set $\mathcal{U}_{\tilde{\mathcal{S}}} = h_\varepsilon(\mathcal{U}_{\tilde{\mathcal{S}}}) \subseteq \Lambda$ where a.e. point is recurrent for $(\tilde{f}_\varepsilon)_{|\Lambda_\varepsilon}$. See Figure 2.

We now apply Theorem 3.4 for the orbit $(x_i)_{i=0,\ldots,n}$ of the scattering map σ_ε on Λ_ε and we obtain that, for any $\delta > 0$ there exists an orbit $z_{i+1} = f_\varepsilon^{k_i}(z_i)$ of f_ε satisfies

$d(z_i, x_i) < \delta$, $i = 0, \ldots, n$. Therefore we obtain that

$$d(z_i, \mathcal{S}_\varepsilon(t_i)) < \delta + K\mu(\varepsilon).$$

□

5.5. **Proof of Corollary 3.11.** By continuity, since $J\nabla S$ is transverse to one level set of the variable I in Λ, it is transverse to a $O(1)$-family of level sets of the variable I. More precisely, there exist two compact disks $D^d \subseteq B^d$, $E^d \subseteq \mathbb{T}^d$, of radii independent of ε, such that $J\nabla S$ is transverse to each level set $\{I = I_a\}$ at $\tilde{\sigma}_0(I_a, \phi_a)$ for $I_a \in D^d$, $\phi_a \in E^d$.

Let $\Delta = D^d \times E^d$ and let

$$\Delta^\infty = \bigcup_{n \geq 0} \tilde{f}_\varepsilon^n(\Delta).$$

Note that $\Delta \subseteq \Delta^\infty$ and that Δ^∞ is positively invariant, i.e., $\tilde{f}_\varepsilon(\Delta^\infty) \subseteq \Delta^\infty$.

We have the following dichotomy:

I. Either $\mu(\Delta^\infty) = \infty$,
II. Or $\mu(\Delta^\infty) < \infty$.

Case I implies right away that for every $N > 0$, there there exists an orbit $(\tilde{f}_\varepsilon^n(\tilde{x}))_{n \geq 0}$ of $\tilde{f}_\varepsilon$ in Λ for which $\|I(\tilde{f}^{k_N}(\tilde{x})) - I(\tilde{x})\| > N$. It follows immediately that there exist orbits of f_ε as in the statement of the theorem. Notice that in this case we obtain diffusing orbits only by applying the inner dynamics; we do not have to use the scattering map.

Now we consider Case II. Since $\mu(\Delta^\infty) < \infty$ we can apply the Poincaré Recurrence Theorem, so for every open set $U \subseteq \Delta$, almost every point of U is recurrent.

By the assumption on the scattering map, we have that for each $(I_0, \phi_0) \in D^d \times E^d$, the curve $\mathcal{S}(t)$, $t \in [0, 1]$, obtained by integrating the vector field $J\nabla S$ with initial condition at (I_0, ϕ_0) is transverse to every level set $\{I = I_a\}$ at a point $\mathcal{S}(t) = (I(t), \phi(t))$, where $(I(t), \phi(t)) \in D^d \times E^d = \Delta$, for all $t \in [0, 1]$ and all $0 < \varepsilon < \varepsilon_1$. Thus, there exists $\rho_0 > 0$, independent of ε, such that

$$\|I(\mathcal{S}(1)) - I(\mathcal{S}(0))\| > \rho_0.$$

Choose an ε_1 as in Theorem 3.10 and fix an $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_1)$. Choose $0 < \delta < \rho_0/4$, and restrict ε_1 if necessary in such a way that $K\mu(\varepsilon) \leq \delta$ and let $\rho = \rho_0 - 4\delta > 0$. Theorem 3.10 implies that there is an orbit $(z_i)_{i=0,\ldots,n}$ of f_ε such that $d(z_0, \mathcal{S}(0)) < 2\delta$ and $d(z_n, \mathcal{S}(1)) < 2\delta$. Thus, we have $\|I(z_n) - I(z_0)\| > \rho_0 - 4\delta = \rho$. □

Appendix A. Normally hyperbolic invariant manifolds and the scattering map.

In this section we recall the scattering map as defined in [23].

Let $f : M \to M$ a C^r map on a C^r-differentiable manifold M. We assume that there exists a compact manifold $\Lambda \subseteq M$ that is a normally hyperbolic invariant manifold for f. That is, there exists a splitting of the tangent bundle of TM into Df-invariant sub-bundles

$$TM = E^u \oplus E^s \oplus T\Lambda,$$

and there exist a constant $C > 0$ and rates $0 < \lambda < \mu^{-1} < 1$, such that for all $x \in \Lambda$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} v \in E^s_x &\Leftrightarrow \|Df^k_x(v)\| \le C\lambda^k \|v\| \text{ for all } k \ge 0, \\ v \in E^u_x &\Leftrightarrow \|Df^k_x(v)\| \le C\lambda^{-k} \|v\| \text{ for all } k \le 0, \\ v \in T_x\Lambda &\Leftrightarrow \|Df^k_x(v)\| \le C\mu^{|k|} \|v\| \text{ for all } k \in \mathbb{Z}. \end{aligned}$$

See [27, 39].

Assume that there exists an integer $\ell > 0$ such that $\ell \le \min(r, (\log \lambda^{-1})(\log \mu)^{-1})$. Then Λ is C^ℓ-differentiable, and its stable and unstable manifolds $W^s(\Lambda)$, $W^u(\Lambda)$ are C^ℓ-differentiable manifolds. See [53].

The manifold $W^s(\Lambda)$, $W^u(\Lambda)$ are foliated by stable and unstable manifolds of points $W^s(z)$, $W^u(z')$ respectively, with $z, z' \in \Lambda$, which are C^r-differentiable manifolds. The foliations are $C^{\ell-1}$-differentiable. For each $x \in W^s(\Lambda)$ there exists a unique $x^+ \in \Lambda$ such that $x \in W^s(x^+)$, and for each $x \in W^u(\Lambda)$ there exists a unique $x^- \in \Lambda$ such that $x \in W^u(x^-)$. We define the wave maps $\Omega^+ : W^s(\Lambda) \to \Lambda$ by $\Omega^+(x) = x^+$ and $\Omega^- : W^u(\Lambda) \to \Lambda$ by $\Omega^-(x) = x^-$. The maps Ω^+ and Ω^- are $C^{\ell-1}$-smooth.

We assume that there exists a transverse homoclinic manifold $\Gamma \subseteq M$, which is $C^{\ell-1}$-differentiable. This means that $\Gamma \subseteq W^u(\Lambda) \cap W^s(\Lambda)$ and, for each $x \in \Gamma$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} T_xM &= T_xW^u(\Lambda) + T_xW^s(\Lambda), \\ T_x\Gamma &= T_xW^u(\Lambda) \cap T_xW^s(\Lambda). \end{aligned} \tag{A.1}$$

We assume the additional conditions that for each $x \in \Gamma$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} T_xW^s(\Lambda) &= T_xW^s(x^+) \oplus T_x\Gamma, \\ T_xW^u(\Lambda) &= T_xW^u(x^-) \oplus T_x\Gamma, \end{aligned} \tag{A.2}$$

where x^-, x^+ are the uniquely defined points in Λ corresponding to x. We also assume that Γ is a homoclinic channels, i.e., Ω^-, Ω^+ restricted to Γ are diffeomorphisms. Hence, we can define a scattering map

$$\sigma : \Omega^-(\Gamma) \to \Omega^+(\Gamma), \quad \sigma = \Omega^+ \circ (\Omega^-)^{-1},$$

which is a diffeomorphism from $\Omega^-(\Gamma)$ to $\Omega^+(\Gamma)$.

If $\sigma(x^-) = x^+$, then there exits a unique $x \in \Gamma$ such that $W^u(x^-) \cap W^s(x^+) \cap \Gamma = \{x\}$. Note that the backwards orbit $f^{-n}(x)$ of x in M is asymptotic to the backwards orbit $f^{-n}(x^-)$ in Λ, and the forward orbit $f^m(x)$ of x in M is asymptotic to the forward orbit $f^m(x^+)$ in Λ.

Appendix B. Correctly aligned windows

We review briefly the topological method of correctly aligned windows. We follow [60] (see also [34, 32]).

Definition B.1. An (m_1, m_2)-window in an m-dimensional manifold M, where $m_1 + m_2 = m$, is a a C^0-homeomorphism χ from some open neighborhood $\mathrm{dom}(\chi)$ of

$[0,1]^{m_1} \times [0,1]^{m_2}$ in $\mathbb{R}^{m_1} \times \mathbb{R}^{m_2}$ to an open subset $\mathrm{im}(\chi)$ of M, together with the homeomorphic image $W = \chi([0,1]^{m_1} \times [0,1]^{m_2})$, and with a choice of an 'exit set'

$$W^{\mathrm{exit}} = \chi\left(\partial[0,1]^{m_1} \times [0,1]^{m_2}\right)$$

and of an 'entry set'

$$W^{\mathrm{entry}} = \chi\left([0,1]^{m_1} \times \partial[0,1]^{m_2}\right).$$

In the sequel, when we refer to a window we mean the set W together with the underlying local parametrization χ.

Definition B.2. Let W_1 and W_2 be (m_1, m_2)-windows, let χ_1 and χ_2 be the corresponding local parametrizations. Let f be a continuous map on M with $f(\mathrm{im}(\chi_1)) \subseteq \mathrm{im}(\chi_2)$, and let $f_\chi = \chi_2^{-1} \circ f \circ \chi_1$. We say that W_1 is correctly aligned with W_2 under f if the following conditions are satisfied:

(i) There exists a continuous homotopy $h : [0,1] \times ([0,1]^{m_1} \times [0,1]^{m_2}) \to \mathbb{R}^{m_1} \times \mathbb{R}^{m_2}$, such that the following conditions hold true

$$\begin{aligned} h_0 &= f_\chi, \\ h([0,1], \partial[0,1]^{m_1} \times [0,1]^{m_2}) \cap ([0,1]^{m_1} \times [0,1]^{m_2}) &= \emptyset, \\ h([0,1], [0,1]^{m_1} \times [0,1]^{m_2}) \cap ([0,1]^{m_1} \times \partial[0,1]^{m_2}) &= \emptyset, \end{aligned}$$

(ii) There exists $y_0 \in [0,1]^{m_2}$ such that the map $A_{y_0} : [0,1]^{m_1} \to \mathbb{R}^{m_1}$ defined by $A_{y_0}(x) = \pi_{m_1}(h_1(x, y_0))$ satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} A_{y_0}\left(\partial[0,1]^{m_1}\right) &\subseteq \mathbb{R}^{m_1} \setminus [0,1]^{m_1}, \\ \deg(A_{y_0}, 0) &\neq 0, \end{aligned}$$

where $\pi_{m_1} : \mathbb{R}^{m_1} \times \mathbb{R}^{m_2} \to \mathbb{R}^{m_1}$ is the projection onto the first component, and $\deg(\cdot, 0)$ is the Brouwer degree of a map at 0.

The following is a shadowing lemma type of result for correctly aligned windows.

Theorem B.3. *Let $f : M \to M$ be a homeomorphism, W_i be a collection of (m_1, m_2)-windows in M, and $\{t_i\}$ be a collection of positive integers, where $i \in \mathbb{Z}$. If W_i is correctly aligned with W_{i+1} under f^{t_i} for each i, then there exists a point $p \in W_0$ such that*

$$(f^{t_i} \circ \ldots \circ f^{t_0})(p) \in W_{i+1} \text{ for all } i.$$

Moreover, if for some $k > 0$ we have $t_{i+k} = t_i$ and $W_{i+k} = W_i$ for all i, then the point p can be chosen periodic of period $t_0 + \ldots + t_{k-1}$.

The correct alignment satisfies a natural product property. Given two windows and a map, if each window can be written as a product of window components, and if the components of the first window are correctly aligned with the corresponding components of the second window under the appropriate components of the map, then the first window is correctly aligned with the second window under the given map. The details can be found in [32].

We describe the product property in a special case, which corresponds to the situation considered in the paper.

Let $f : M \to M$ be a homeomorphism of the m-dimensional manifold M. Denote by $B^k_\rho(x)$ the k-dimensional closed ball of radius ρ centered at the point x in $\mathbb{R}^k$. Assume that $c, u, s \in \mathbb{N}$ are such that $c+u+s = m$, and write each $x \in \mathbb{R}^m$ as $x = (x^c, x^u, x^s)$, with $x^c \in \mathbb{R}^c$, $x^u \in \mathbb{R}^u$, and $x^s \in \mathbb{R}^s$. Let p_1, p_2 be two points in M, and let χ_1, χ_2 be two systems of local coordinates about p_1, p_2, respectively. Relative to these coordinate systems, we write $p_1 = (p_1^c, p_1^u, p_1^s)$ and $p_2 = (p_2^c, p_2^u, p_2^s)$.

Lemma B.4. *Define two sets, W_1 in the local chart around p_1, and W_2 in the local chart around p_2, such that, in the corresponding local coordinates, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} W_1 &= B^c_{\rho_1^c}(p_1^c) \times B^u_{\rho_1^u}(p_1^u) \times B^s_{\rho_1^s}(p_1^s), \\ W_2 &= B^c_{\rho_2^c}(p_2^c) \times B^u_{\rho_2^u}(p_2^u) \times B^s_{\rho_1^s}(p_2^s), \end{aligned}$$

for some $\rho_1^c, \rho_1^u, \rho_1^s, \rho_2^c, \rho_2^s, \rho_2^u > 0$. Let

$$\begin{aligned} W_1^{exit} = &\quad \partial B^c_{\rho_1^c}(p_1^c) \times B^u_{\rho_1^u}(p_1^u) \times B^s_{\rho_1^s}(p_1^s) \\ &\cup B^c_{\rho_1^c}(p_1^c) \times \partial B^u_{\rho_1^u}(p_1^u) \times B^s_{\rho_1^s}(p_1^s), \\ W_1^{entry} = &B^c_{\rho_1^c}(p_1^c) \times B^u_{\rho_1^u}(p_1^u) \times \partial B^s_{\rho_1^s}(p_1^s), \\ W_2^{exit} = &\quad \partial B^c_{\rho_2^c}(p_2^c) \times B^u_{\rho_2^u}(p_2^u) \times B^s_{\rho_2^s}(p_2^s) \\ &\cup B^c_{\rho_2^c}(p_2^c) \times \partial B^u_{\rho_2^u}(p_2^u) \times B^s_{\rho_2^s}(p_2^s), \\ W_2^{entry} = &B^c_{\rho_2^c}(p_2^c) \times B^u_{\rho_2^u}(p_2^u) \times \partial B^s_{\rho_2^s}(p_2^s). \end{aligned}$$

Assume that the map f, written in local coordinates, satisfies the following conditions relative to W_1 and W_2:

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_c \circ f(B^c_{\rho_1^c}(p_1^c) \times \{p_1^u\} \times \{p_1^s\}) &\supseteq B^c_{\rho_2^c}(p_2^c), \\ \pi_u \circ f(\{p_1^c\} \times B^u_{\rho_1^u}(p_1^u) \times \{p_1^s\}) &\supseteq B^u_{\rho_2^u}(p_2^u), \\ \pi_s \circ f(\{p_1^c\} \times \{p_1^u\} \times B^s_{\rho_1^s}(p_1^s)) &\subseteq B^s_{\rho_2^s}(p_2^s), \end{aligned}$$

where π_c, π_u, π_s denote the standard projections onto $\mathbb{R}^c$, $\mathbb{R}^u$, $\mathbb{R}^s$ respectively.

Then W_1 and W_2 are $(c+u, s)$-windows, and W_1 is correctly aligned with W_2 under f.

This lemma is an immediate consequence of Proposition 3 in [32].

References

[1] Inmaculada Baldomá, Ernest Fontich, Marcel Guardia, and Tere M. Seara. Exponentially small splitting of separatrices beyond Melnikov analysis: rigorous results. *J. Differential Equations*, 253(12):3304–3439, 2012.

[2] P. Bernard, V. Kaloshin, and K. Zhang. Arnold diffusion in arbitrary degrees of freedom and 3-dimensional normally hyperbolic invariant cylinders, arXiv:1112.2773.

[3] Ugo Bessi, Luigi Chierchia, and Enrico Valdinoci. Upper bounds on Arnold diffusion times via Mather theory. *J. Math. Pures Appl. (9)*, 80(1):105–129, 2001.

[4] S. Bolotin and D. Treschev. Unbounded growth of energy in nonautonomous Hamiltonian systems. *Nonlinearity*, 12(2):365–388, 1999.

[5] Abed Bounemoura. An example of instability in high-dimensional Hamiltonian systems. *Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN*, (3):685–716, 2012.

[6] E. Canalias, A. Delshams, J. J. Masdemont, and P. Roldán. The scattering map in the planar restricted three body problem. *Celestial Mech. Dynam. Astronom.*, 95(1-4):155–171, 2006.

[7] M. Capinski, M. Gidea, and R. De la Llave. Arnold diffusion in the planar elliptic restricted three-body problem: mechanism and numerical simulation, 2014.
[8] C.-Q. Cheng. Arnold diffusion in nearly integrable Hamiltonian systems. *ArXiv e-prints*, July 2012.
[9] Chong-Qing Cheng and Jun Yan. Existence of diffusion orbits in a priori unstable Hamiltonian systems. *J. Differential Geom.*, 67(3):457–517, 2004.
[10] Chong-Qing Cheng and Jun Yan. Arnold diffusion in Hamiltonian systems: a priori unstable case. *J. Differential Geom.*, 82(2):229–277, 2009.
[11] Boris V. Chirikov. A universal instability of many-dimensional oscillator systems. *Phys. Rep.*, 52(5):264–379, 1979.
[12] Rafael de la Llave. Orbits of unbounded energy in perturbations of geodesic flows by periodic potentials. a simple construction. Preprint, 2004.
[13] D. del Castillo-Negrete, J. M. Greene, and P. J. Morrison. Renormalization and transition to chaos in area preserving nontwist maps. *Phys. D*, 100(3-4):311–329, 1997.
[14] A. Delshams, R. de la Llave, and T. M-Seara. A geometric mechanism for diffusion in Hamiltonian systems overcoming the large gap problem: heuristics and rigorous verification on a model. *Mem. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 179(844):viii+141, 2006.
[15] A. Delshams, R. De la Llave, and T. M-Seara. Instability of high dimensional hamiltonian systems: Multiple resonances do not impede diffusion, 2012.
[16] A. Delshams, R. de la Llave, and T.M. Seara. Instability of high dimensional hamiltonian systems: Multiple resonances do not impede diffusion, 2013.
[17] A. Delshams, M. Gidea, and P. Roldan. Arnold's mechanism of diffusion in the spatial circular restricted three-body problem: A semi-numerical argument, 2010.
[18] A. Delshams, M. Gidea, and P. Roldan. Transition map and shadowing lemma for normally hyperbolic invariant manifolds. *Discrete and Continuous Dynamical Systems. Series A.*, 3(33):1089–1112, 2013.
[19] Amadeu Delshams and Rafael de la Llave. KAM theory and a partial justification of Greene's criterion for nontwist maps. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 31(6):1235–1269, 2000.
[20] Amadeu Delshams, Rafael de la Llave, and Tere M. Seara. A geometric approach to the existence of orbits with unbounded energy in generic periodic perturbations by a potential of generic geodesic flows of $\mathbf{T}^2$. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 209(2):353–392, 2000.
[21] Amadeu Delshams, Rafael de la Llave, and Tere M. Seara. A geometric mechanism for diffusion in Hamiltonian systems overcoming the large gap problem: announcement of results. *Electron. Res. Announc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 9:125–134, 2003.
[22] Amadeu Delshams, Rafael de la Llave, and Tere M. Seara. Orbits of unbounded energy in quasi-periodic perturbations of geodesic flows. *Adv. Math.*, 202(1):64–188, 2006.
[23] Amadeu Delshams, Rafael de la Llave, and Tere M. Seara. Geometric properties of the scattering map of a normally hyperbolic invariant manifold. *Adv. Math.*, 217(3):1096–1153, 2008.
[24] Amadeu Delshams, Marian Gidea, Rafael de la Llave, and Tere M. Seara. Geometric approaches to the problem of instability in Hamiltonian systems. An informal presentation. In *Hamiltonian dynamical systems and applications*, NATO Sci. Peace Secur. Ser. B Phys. Biophys., pages 285–336. Springer, Dordrecht, 2008.
[25] Amadeu Delshams, Marian Gidea, Rafael de la Llave, and Tere M. Seara. Geometric approaches to the problem of instability in Hamiltonian systems. An informal presentation. In *Hamiltonian dynamical systems and applications*, NATO Sci. Peace Secur. Ser. B Phys. Biophys., pages 285–336. Springer, Dordrecht, 2008.
[26] Amadeu Delshams and Gemma Huguet. Geography of resonances and Arnold diffusion in a priori unstable Hamiltonian systems. *Nonlinearity*, 22(8):1997–2077, 2009.
[27] N. Fenichel. Asymptotic stability with rate conditions. *Indiana Univ. Math. J.*, 23:1109–1137, 1973/74.
[28] E. Fontich and P. Martín. Differentiable invariant manifolds for partially hyperbolic tori and a lambda lemma. *Nonlinearity*, 13(5):1561–1593, 2000.

[29] Vassili Gelfreich and Dmitry Turaev. Unbounded energy growth in Hamiltonian systems with a slowly varying parameter. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 283(3):769–794, 2008.
[30] M. Gidea and R. de la Llave. Arnold diffusion with optimal time in the large gap problem, 2006.
[31] M. Gidea and C. Robinson. Diffusion along transition chains of invariant tori and aubry-mather sets. *Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems*, 2012.
[32] Marian Gidea and Rafael de la Llave. Topological methods in the instability problem of Hamiltonian systems. *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst.*, 14(2):295–328, 2006.
[33] Marian Gidea and Rafael de la Llave. Perturbations of geodesic flows by recurrent dynamics, arXiv:1307.1617.
[34] Marian Gidea and Clark Robinson. Topologically crossing heteroclinic connections to invariant tori. *J. Differential Equations*, 193(1):49–74, 2003.
[35] A. Granados, S. J. Hogan, and T. M. Seara. The scattering map in two coupled piecewise-smooth systems, with numerical application to rocking blocks. *Phys. D*, 269:1–20, 2014.
[36] G. Haller. Universal homoclinic bifurcations and chaos near double resonances. *J. Statist. Phys.*, 86(5-6):1011–1051, 1997.
[37] G. Haller. *Chaos near resonance*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1999.
[38] M. Hirsch, J. Palis, C. Pugh, and M. Shub. Neighborhoods of hyperbolic sets. *Invent. Math.*, 9:121–134, 1969/1970.
[39] M.W. Hirsch, C.C. Pugh, and M. Shub. *Invariant manifolds*, volume 583 of *Lecture Notes in Math.* Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1977.
[40] V. Kaloshin. Geometric proofs of Mather's connecting and accelerating theorems. In *Topics in dynamics and ergodic theory*, volume 310 of *London Math. Soc. Lecture Note Ser.*, pages 81–106. Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 2003.
[41] V. Kaloshin and K. Zhang. Normally hyperbolic invariant manifolds near strong double resonance, arXiv:1202.1032.
[42] V. Kaloshin and K. Zhang. A strong form of arnold diffusion for two and a half degrees of freedom, arXiv:1212.1150.
[43] V. Kaloshin and K. Zhang. A strong form of arnold diffusion for three and a half degrees of freedom, http://www.math.utoronto.ca/kzhang/files/announce-three-and-half.pdf.
[44] M. A. Lieberman and Jeffrey L. Tennyson. Chaotic motion along resonance layers in near-integrable Hamiltonian systems with three or more degrees of freedom. In *Long-time prediction in dynamics (Lakeway, Tex., 1981)*, volume 2 of *Nonequilib. Problems Phys. Sci. Biol.*, pages 179–211. Wiley, New York, 1983.
[45] Pierre Lochak. Arnold diffusion; a compendium of remarks and questions. In *Hamiltonian systems with three or more degrees of freedom (S'Agaró, 1995)*, volume 533 of *NATO Adv. Sci. Inst. Ser. C Math. Phys. Sci.*, pages 168–183. Kluwer Acad. Publ., Dordrecht, 1999.
[46] Jean-Pierre Marco. Modèles pour les applications fibrées et les polysystèmes. *C. R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris*, 346(3-4):203–208, 2008.
[47] Jean-Pierre Marco. Generic hyperbolic properties of classical systems on the torus. Preprint, 2013.
[48] John N. Mather. Arnol′d diffusion. I. Announcement of results. *J. Math. Sci. (N. Y.)*, 124(5):5275–5289, 2004.
[49] John N. Mather. Arnold diffusion by variational methods. In *Essays in mathematics and its applications*, pages 271–285. Springer, Heidelberg, 2012.
[50] G. N. Piftankin. Diffusion speed in the Mather problem. *Dokl. Akad. Nauk*, 408(6):736–737, 2006.
[51] G. N. Piftankin and D. V. Treshchëv. Separatrix maps in Hamiltonian systems. *Uspekhi Mat. Nauk*, 62(2(374)):3–108, 2007.
[52] Charles Pugh and Michael Shub. Linearization of normally hyperbolic diffeomorphisms and flows. *Invent. Math.*, 10:187–198, 1970.
[53] Clark Robinson. Differentiable conjugacy near compact invariant manifolds. *Bol. Soc. Brasil. Mat.*, 2(1):33–44, 1971.
[54] L. Sabbagh. An inclination lemma for normally hyperbolic manifolds with an application to diffusion, 2014.

[55] Jeffrey Tennyson. Resonance transport in near-integrable systems with many degrees of freedom. *Phys. D*, 5(1):123–135, 1982.
[56] D. Treschev. Multidimensional symplectic separatrix maps. *J. Nonlinear Sci.*, 12(1):27–58, 2002.
[57] D. Treschev. Trajectories in a neighbourhood of asymptotic surfaces of a priori unstable Hamiltonian systems. *Nonlinearity*, 15(6):2033–2052, 2002.
[58] D. Treschev. Evolution of slow variables in a priori unstable Hamiltonian systems. *Nonlinearity*, 17(5):1803–1841, 2004.
[59] D. Treschev. Arnold diffusion far from strong resonances in multidimensional *a priori* unstable Hamiltonian systems. *Nonlinearity*, 25(9):2717–2757, 2012.
[60] Piotr Zgliczyński and Marian Gidea. Covering relations for multidimensional dynamical systems. *J. Differential Equations*, 202(1):32–58, 2004.
[61] Ke Zhang. Speed of Arnold diffusion for analytic Hamiltonian systems. *Invent. Math.*, 186(2):255–290, 2011.

Yeshiva University, Department of Mathematical Sciences, New York, NY 10016, USA
E-mail address: Marian.Gidea@yu.edu

School of Mathematics, Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, GA 30332, USA
E-mail address: rafael.delallave@math.gatech.edu

Departament de Matemàtica Aplicada I, Universitat Politècnica de Catalunya, Diagonal 647, 08028 Barcelona, Spain
E-mail address: Tere.M-Seara@upc.edu